WORKING PAPER No. 31

Inequality in the Distribution of Land Holdings and Assets among Households in Gokilapuram Village:

A REPORT FROM A FIELD SURVEY

by

V. K. Ramachandran

MADRAS INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

79, SECOND MAIN ROAD, GANDHINAGAR, ADYAR

MADRAS 600 020

MADRAS INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

WORKING PAPER No.31

INEQUALITY IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF LAND HOLDINGS AND ASSETS AMONG HOUSEHOLDS IN GOKILAPURAM VILLAGE : A REPORT FROM A FIELD SURVEY

by

V.K. Ramachandran

....

79, Second Main Road, Gandhinagar,
Adyar, MADRAS 600 020

June, 1983

CONTENTS

		Page No.
I :	INTRODUCTION	1
	General description	1
	Uthamapalayam taluk and Gokilapuram Village in the Census of India	3
	Irrigation and cropping patterns in the Valley in the 1970s	6
	Sources of employment in Gokilapuram Village	16
II :	OBJECTIVES OF THE PAPER	20
III :	STATEMENT OF METHOD	21
	i) Main concepts and definitions	21
	ii) Survey method and survey period	29
	iii) Reference period	32
IV :	METHODS OF CLASSIFICATION OF HOUSEHOLDS	32
	i) Standard classification: by size categories of ownership and operational holdings	32
	ii) Economic classification of households	35
V :	LAND HOLDINGS IN THE VILLAGE	57
	By size categories of ownership and operational holdings	57
	Comparison with WAC data	68
	By economic classification of the population	69
	Two-way Tables	81
VI :	ASSET HOLDINGS IN THE VILLAGE	82
	By size category of ownership holdings	84
	By economic classification	90
	CONCLUSIONS FROM SECTIONS V AND VI	96
	Acknowledgements	101
	APPENDIX OF TABLES (with separate list of contents)	

******

INEQUALITY IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF LAND HOLDINGS AND ASSETS AMONG HOUSEHOLDS IN GOKILAPURAM VILLAGE : A REPORT FROM A FIELD SURVEY

V.K. Ramachandran

.....

I Introduction

Gokilapuram village is located in the Uthamapalayam block of Uthamapalayam taluk (Uthamapalayam taluk lies between latitudes 9°34' and 10°10' N and longitudes 77°10' and 77°28 E) in south western Madurai district. The village is part of the Cumbum valley, a distinct geographical and economic region of Madurai district. The valley is shaped, roughly speaking, like an inverted triangle with a rounded apex, wedged between the Cardamom hills, whose watershed marks the western and southwestern wall of the Valley (and the border in the Kerala) and the High Wavy and Varushanad hills in the east and south east. The major source of surface irrigation was from the Suruliyar-Vairavanar river system; from the turn of this century, the waters of the Periyar river have been dammed and diverted eastwards from Thekkady in Kerala and through the river beds of the Valley.

The geographical area of the Cumbum Valley covers Uthamapalayam, consisting of four blocks -- Cumbum, Uthamapalayam, Chinnamanur and Bodinayakanur -- and some villages in the Theni block of Periyakulam taluk, about 55 villages in all.

The central core of the Valley consists of land irrigated by canals and systems tanks that are part of the Periyar system -- a rich green core of land that is largely double-cropped paddy land. Around this tract is lift-irrigated land (irrigated by wells), land that is marked by a diversified cropping

pattern. Scattered between the lift irrigated land and stretching beyond it to the foothills is the unirrigated crop land of the Valley. The Valley is a region with a relatively developed level of agricultural technique, with new methods being introduced in the cultivation of a diversifying variety of crops, which are grown on an increasingly commercial scale. The vanguard agriculture of this region draws upon a numerically preponderant, largely settled, force of agricultural labourers, supplemented by seasonal inflows of migratory labour.

Gokilapuram village is situated off the major highway, although on long-distance and local bus routes, about 5 kilometres east of the taluk headquarters at Uthamapalayam. To the west and south of the village lies its wet land, more than 600 acres of prime surface-irrigated land in the revenue village, irrigated directly by canals and by canal-fed tanks. To the south, the village tapers off in a long tail, consisting of canal-irrigated tracts, that runs about 5 kilometres long. The western boundary of this stretch is marked by the Periyar river and the eastern by the Palayamparavu channel, a right-bank Periyar channel of a total length of 21 km., which diverts from a head sluice on the river at a point south of the village. This channel feeds the village channels and the village tanks and continues its northward flow, its course marking the eastern boundary of the village. The wet land slopes downwards from east to west, making for drainage of irrigation water from the crop land back to the river.

To the east of the village settlement -- the settlement occupies the north-eastern corner of the revenue precincts of the village -- a road crosses the canal and travels east, through the neighbouring village of Anamalaivanpatti (also called Mallingapuram) to the village (and formerly the central village of the zamindari estate) of Erasakkanayakanur.

Ten to fifteen kilometres to the east of Gokilapuram, the eastern range rises sharply from the plains. While the land along the eastern road and upto the hills is predominantly unirrigated, it is also marked by a growing, and in economic terms assertive, sector of lift-irrigated land.

To the north of the village are a few plots of lift-irrigated and dry land; a track leading off north goes through the neighbouring village of Karunkattankulam, before curving north west to the town of Chinnamanur, located on the main highway north east of Uthamapalayam. The densely-shaded tamarind groves of Gokilapuram are mainly on the east and north of the village settlement; its coconut groves mainly on the west.

Uthamapalayam taluk and Gokilapuram Village in the Census of India

This section briefly summarises the data from the primary Census abstracts for the village and taluk from the Censuses of 1961, 1971 and 1981. Problems of the data at these Censuses -- particularly in respect of changes in the definition of "workers", of changes in the definition of the village, and of village-level workforce data -- have been discussed elsewhere[1/] and shall not be dealt with here.

The population of Uthamapalayam taluk in 1981 was 485899 persons and its area 1426 sq. km., an average of 341 persons per sq. km. The population of Gokilapuram village in 1981 was 3945 persons (755 households) and the total area of the revenue village 419 hectares. The annual

---

1/ See, for example, S. Guhan and Joan Mencher, Iruvelpattu Revisited, MIDS working paper no.28; V.K. Ramachandran, "Agricultural Labourers in the Working Population of Tamil Nadu", MIDS Bulletin March 1980; S.Subramanian and V.K. Ramachandran, "Agricultural Labourers in the Working Population of Tamil Nadu", MIDS Bulletin, June, 1982.

compound rate of growth of population in the taluk and village has been lower over both decadal periods -- 1961-1971 and 1971-1981 -- than in the district or the State (see Table 1 in the appendix of tables).[1/]

The number of males per thousand population in the taluk has been roughly equal to the figure for the state as a whole at the three Censuses; for the village, the figure has been higher at all three Censuses, although it has declined from 525 in 1961 to 510 in 1981 (see Table 2).

Literate persons as a per cent of total population have, in general, been slightly higher in the taluk and village than in the State as a whole (see Table 3) : a feature of this is that the percentage of male literates is markedly higher, while that of female literates only marginally so (in 1961, the number of female literates to total female population in the taluk was actually lower than the corresponding figure for the State).

Persons belonging to the scheduled castes as a per cent of total population has been generally higher for the village than the averages for the State, district and taluk (see Table 4), although the figures on scheduled castes for the State and district in 1981 are not yet available to us.

While in 1961, work force as a per cent of total population was lower for the taluk and village than for the State as a whole and for the district, it was considerably higher at the Censuses of 1971 and 1981 (see Table 5). This is particularly so in the case of the village : in 1971, work force as a per cent of total population was 52.00 per cent

----

1/ The settling of the labour force on the cardamom plantations during the 1971-1981 period could have been a factor in the significantly lower rate of growth of population in the village over the second decade.

(State average : 35.78 per cent) and in 1981, main and marginal workers as a per cent of total population was 58.50 per cent (State average : 42.60 per cent).

The significant features of the Census data on the work force (see Table 6) are the following:

-- The incidence of agricultural labour in the working population[1] of the taluk has been higher than for the State as a whole at all three Censuses; in 1981, the incidence of agricultural labourers in the taluk as a whole was 57.30 per cent, the State average being 31.45 per cent. At the Census of 1981, the incidence of agricultural labourers in the rural segment of the taluk was the second highest among all taluks in the State, after Thiruvarur taluk in Thanjavur district. Wirh reference to the village, in 1961 there appears to have been a significant misclassification of workers in agricultural labour, many of them having been wrongly entered as workers in "other services" (occupational category IX). At the Censuses of 1971 and 1981, this misclassification appears to have been corrected: the incidence of agricultural labourers in 1981 was 59.97 per cent (State average : 31.45 per cent).

-- The high incidence of agricultural labourers is particularly marked in the case of female workers. In 1981, for instance, the incidence of female agricultural labourers was 52.26 per cent for Tamil Nadu as a whole; for the taluk it was 74.43 per cent and for the village, 75.20 per cent.

1/ defined as the number of agricultural labourers as a per cent of the total working population at the Censuses of 1961 and 1971, and the number of agricultural workers (main workers) as a per cent of total main workers in 1981.

-- There has been a sharp increase in the incidence of agricultural labourers over the bidecadal period; for the taluk, incidence has increased from 21.93 per cent in 1961 to 57.30 per cent in 1981.

-- The incidence of "cultivators" in the working population has declined sharply over the bidecadal period; in the taluk, the incidence of cultivators was 31.96 per cent in 1961 (State average : 42.07 per cent) and 18.32 per cent in 1981 (State average : 29.40 per cent). For the village, the corresponding figures are 40.79 per cent in 1961 and 20.04 per cent in 1981.

Irrigation and Cropping Patterns in the Valley in the 1970s: Trends from Official Sources of Data

In this section we have used data for Uthamapalayam taluk as a proxy for the Valley as a whole. The main sources of data for this section are:

-- the World Agricultural Census, Tamil Nadu (1970-71 (WAC) : taluk-wise, block-wise and village-wise returns;

-- cropping pattern data from the Cumbum, Uthamapalayam, Chinnamanur and Bodinayakanur panchayat union offices for 1973-74;

-- Revenue returns on irrigation, land use, gross cropped area and crop pattern 1980-81, village-wise and for the taluk; and

-- cropping pattern data for the taluk from the Uthamapalayam taluk office for successive agricultural years from 1976-77 to 1980-81.

-- We have also referred to cropping pattern data from the office of the Deputy Agricultural Officer (DAO), Cumbum Block, relating to the years 1971-72 to 1975-76, from the DAO (Banana), Chinnamanur and the DAO (Banana Package Scheme) Uthamapalayam.

The starting points of many of the changes that can be identified in the data considerably pre-date the 1970s: it is a limitation of this section that its main data base relates only to the seventies.

Irrigation:

The table below provides the standard index of extent of irrigation : net irrigated area as a per cent of net sown area:

Table 7 : Net Irrigated Area and Net Sown Area, Uthamapalayam Taluk, 1970-71 and 1980-81 (Acres)

Year (1)	Net sown Area (2)	Net Irrigated Area (3)	(3) As Per cent of (2) (4)
1970-71	143843	41926	29.15
1980-81	146407	58647	40.06

While the bulk of net sown area still remains without any source of irrigation, the data indicate an increase over the decade in area under some form of irrigation. While the continued existence of a large unirrigated and relatively

backward sector constitutes a major drag on agricultural development, it is, of course, the irrigated sector that is the main arena of agricultural transformation -- where the vanguard features of the agrosystem of the Valley are most evident. The economic significance of this sector is partially indicated by the fact that the gross cropped area under irrigated crops as a per cent of total gross cropped area is considerably higher than net irrigated area as a per cent of net sown area.

Table 8 : Gross Cropped Area (GCA) Under Irrigated Crops as a Per cent of Total G.C.A., Uthamapalayam Taluk, 1970-71 and 1980-81 (in per cent)

Year	GCA under irrigated crops as per cent of total G.C.A.	G.C.A. under irrigated food-grain crops as per cent of GCA under all food-grains	G.C.A. under irrigated non-foodgrain crops as a per cent of GCA under all crops other than foodgrain
1970-71	40.72	45.92	30.53
1980-81	51.18	51.18	54.97

Read with Table 7, the data straight away indicate a more intensive use of irrigated land than unirrigated. They also indicate an increase over the decade in the irrigated sector of gross cropped area. This increase (and corresponding intensiveness in land use) is particularly marked in respect of irrigated crops other than foodgrains, which, as shall be discussed later, are mainly grown on land irrigated by wells.

Table 8a provides a more detailed view of the irrigation picture. Net sown area under the two main sources of surface irrigation -- canals and tanks -- has remained fairly stable over the decade. While in 1980-81, only 13.41 per cent of the net sown area was irrigated by canals and tanks, it must be noted that this represents a particularly weighty thirteen per cent : in three blocks -- Cumbum, Uthamapalayam and Chinnamanur -- out of four in the taluk (together these 3 blocks account for 64.56 per cent of net area under canals and tanks in the taluk), canals and tanks are part of the Periyar system, and receive water for about 9 months (or two paddy crops) in the year. Land in the Periyar ayacut is the highest-priced in the Valley; the importance of surface-irrigated land is also indicated by the fact that paddy, mostly grown on these tracts, occupies the largest share of any individual crop in the gross cropped area of the taluk. (see Table 9 below)

Table 8a: Net Irrigated Area Under Different Sources of Irrigation and Unirrigated Land as a Per cent of Net Sown Area, Uthamapalayam Taluk, 1970-71 and 1980-81

(in per cent)

Year	Canals	Tanks	Canals & Tanks	Tube wells	Other wells	All wells	Others	Unirrigated land	Total
1970-71	9.42	2.56	11.98	0.20	16.26	16.86	0.71	70.85	100.00
1980-81	8.83	4.58	13.41	1.09	25.56	26.65	0	59.94	100.00

Net sown area under all types of well irrigation shows a higher percentage than sown area under surface irrigation. While the increase in area under wells began in an earlier period, and received a major stimulus with the advance in rural electrification in the 1950s and 1960s, the data indicate that this trend continued in the 1970s. The progress of well-irrigation, however, cannot be an untrammeled process -- its extension as well as the reliability of irrigation from existing wells are constrained by the limits imposed by a falling water table in the Valley, a problem that is particularly marked in its western regions.

Official sources of data on irrigation are limited in that they do not provide data on the actual water availability from individual sources of irrigation, a problem that is particularly true of area under wells. (In respect of wells, there is also a problem of undercounting of the number of energised wells and of sometimes inaccurate recording of the actual extent served by wells.) Despite this qualification, an important feature of the data in Table 8a is that it indicates a decline in the area that is <u>completely</u> unirrigated, from 70.85 per cent to 59.94 per cent of the net sown area.

Cropping Pattern:

The major trends in the crop pattern of the taluk are given in Table 9 (see appendix of tables).

The data on cropping pattern for the 1970s provide a revealing picture of how tendencies observed for Tamil Nadu for an earlier period[1/] have worked themselves out in a specific region during the decade ending 1980-81. Our main conclusions from the data on crop pattern are as follows:

1. There has been an overall shift over the decade from foodgrain crops (cereals plus pulses) to crops other than

---

1/ See C.T. Kurien *Dynamics of Rural Transformation: A Study of Tamil Nadu 1950-1975*, particularly Chapter III.

foodgrains from 66.19 per cent of gross cropped area to 55.52 per cent. This trend is particularly marked in the case of area under irrigated foodgrain crops, area under which declined over the decade from 74.65 per cent of the gross irrigated cropped area to 52.24 per cent, and to a lesser extent on unirrigated land, from 60.38 per cent to 58.95 per cent.

2. In respect of cereals, however, this shift has not been spread evenly over all cereals. On the one hand, area under paddy has increased, in absolute and relative terms. Paddy was a far second to cholam among all cereals in 1970-71; by 1980-81, area under paddy had increased and it occupied the largest cropped area among cereals, and the largest area under any single crop in the taluk. We also note that in 1980-81, paddy was an entirely irrigated crop, and that the entire area under paddy was planted with high yielding varieties.

On the other hand, area under cholam (both irrigated and unirrigated) and ragi and other cereals (particularly irrigated) decreased significantly, though unsteadily over the decade. Of the coarse cereals, only area under cumbu showed an increase; area under cumbu, however, occupied only 1.85 per cent of gross cropped area in 1980-81. Cumbu in the Valley is also a fairly localised crop, a little over 80 per cent of the total area under the crop being in the Bodinayakanur block.[1/]

1/ Some corroborative material is available from a study conducted in 1981 by the Department of Agricultural Economics Agricultural College and Research Institute, Madurai into changes in the traditionally established crop mix in the Uthamapalayam, Cumbum and Chinnamanur blocks. In a first report on the conclusions from the study it is indicated that over the nine year period from 1970-71 to 1979-80,

- in Uthamapalayam block the area under irrigated cholam declined 91 per cent and irrigated ragi 89 per cent;

contd...

3. Implicit in the points above is a process of diver-sification in the cropping pattern of the taluk over the decade, particularly marked in the irrigated area under non-foodgrain crops.

Going by irrigation-type, on canal- and tank-irrigated land, paddy remains the specialised and dominant crop (the other two crops grown on these lands, betel vine and sugar cane, are localised and occupy only 0.64 per cent of gross irrigated cropped area and 0.33 per cent of total cropped area). In the case of irrigated non-foodgrain crops (or crop categories), every crop except condiments -- that is, including cotton, fruit crops, vegetables, groundnut and coconut -- has registered an increase in the absolute area under the crop and in the relative position of the crop in gross cropped area.1/

On unirrigated land, foodgrains and the two major oilseed crops occupied the major share of the gross cropped area at both end-points of the decade; 90.19 per cent in 1970-71 and 87.68 per cent in 1980-81.

----

contd..

- in Chinnamanur block, area under irrigated cholam declined 79 per cent and under ragi 60 per cent; and
- in Cumbum block area under irrigated ragi declined 60 per cent.

The report suggests that this decline will, in addition to reducing the supply of coarse grain, also have an adverse impact on the supply of fodder, which is already short in the Valley.

1/ From our observation in the Valley -- for reasons noted above, there are no specific data from offi-cial sources on the subject --, it is clear that 'irrigated' cultivation of coarse grain often repre-sents a very poorly irrigated crop, grown on lift-irrigated land that has a well from which water supply is irregular or scanty. More abundant water supply generally makes the way for diversification to non-foodgrain crops.

An interesting feature of the data on cropping pattern is that over the decade, there has been no marked increase in gross cropped area; there is, in fact, a close correspondence between gross cropped area at the two points of time. The data say, then, that diversification has been achieved not through a large scale extension of cropped area, but has occurred through changes in the existing crop mix.

4. The category of orchards (fruit crops) in the official data presents a problem of classification -- it brings together into a single category long term tree crops (such as mango or jackfruit) which are typically grown in groves or individually on poramboke or in compounds or by the roadside, with fruit crops that are field crops (such as banana or grape), which are typically grown on lift irrigated land.[1/] While from the detailed revenue returns, it is possible to separate tree and field crops, this is not possible in the case of WAC returns.

Of the cropped area under orchards in 1980-81, area under banana occupied 66.69 per cent. A significant feature of the cropping pattern of the Valley is the remarkable rapidity with which the cultivation of two varieties of banana -- Dwarf Cavendish and Robusta -- has advanced since the 1960s. Under the Banana Package Scheme, Dwarf Cavendish was introduced in Uthamapalayam taluk in 1966-67; Robusta was introduced in 1972-73; area under these crops increased more than 10 times in the six-year period between 1969-70 and 1975-76, the rich Udayar landlord families of Rayappanpatti village south of Gokilapuram being particularly noteworthy 'innovative farmers' in respect of the cultivation of this crop. The second half of the seventies also saw a steady increase in the total area under banana.

1/ This problem also exists with the category of "condiments", which is an amalgam of tree crops such as tamarind and field crops such as chilli, turmeric and coriander.

Area under grape, a crop that requires high (particularly initial) investment and intensive care over the crop-year, occupied a small, though increasing area on lift-irrigated land in the Valley, particularly in its eastern and southern parts.

5. Area under cotton showed a sharp increase, in absolute acreage and in terms of its share in gross cropped area over the decade; this was because of the increase in respect of irrigated cotton, area under unirrigated cotton having marginally declined. While the overall trend was one of increase, area under this (generally considered price-responsive) crop fluctuated sharply over the decade; one reason for this fluctuation was a pest attack for a two-year period beginning about 1978.

6. Vegetable crops, grown mainly on lift-irrigated land, have shown an overall increase over the decade. These are short-term crops, generally involving short-run decisions in crop management. While in 1980-81, the main vegetable crops in terms of cropped area were onion, tomato (a new variety of tomato, PKM-1, developed in nearby Periyakulam, has been introduced), beetroot and brinjal, there have been changes in the crop mix of vegetable crops, noticeable even over relatively short period. The cultivation of vegetable crops has also received impetus (as have fruit crops such as banana and grape) from the fact of improved transport facilities for perishable crops.

7. There is a significant trend of steady increase in the area under coconut in the taluk -- these trees are planted not merely in the traditional grove areas, but increasingly on lift-irrigated land converted into coconut fields, and intercropped generally with vegetable crops for the first two years. While the intial investment on this presently highly profitable tree crop is high, it is seen as being less demanding than other crops, in the long run, in respect of

water management in lift-irrigated areas, and as being one that will severely cut down on the demand for labour and employment opportunities and consequently on labour costs in crop cultivation on lift-irrigated land.

8. Groundnut acreage has shown an overall decline, though with sharp fluctuations, over the decade. This decline is because of a fall in area under unirrigated groundnut; irrigated (under lift-irrigation) groundnut, while occupying a smaller area, has shown a sharp increase over the decade. Despite the fact of an overall decline, however, groundnut remains an important component of the crop pattern of the taluk, particularly in its southern and southwestern tracts.

9. The case of gingelly (sesamum) presents an interesting case of a steep rise in acreage under an unirrigated crop cultivated largely for the market (and partly for home consumption), grown on favourable terrain on a highly localised scale -- 92.54 per cent of the total area under gingilly in 1980-81 was located in two villages - Melagudalur and Keelagudalur.

This discussion of cropping pattern, as has been mentioned, covers only the limited period of a decade, 1970-71 to 1980-81. The conclusions from the decadal data are not, of course, intended to be pronouncements of finality about future trends in cropping pattern; on the contrary, the data shows the relative quickness with which changes can occur and have occurred in the cropping pattern of the taluk.

The data show that a large sector of the cropped area is still unirrigated and that a significant sector of lift irrigation subject to fluctuations and the constraints of a falling water table. At the same time, a most important conclusion from the data is the impact of an assertive, mainly irrigated, agricultural sector that is profit oriented

and increasingly commercialised (with concomitant features of being investment-intensive, price-responsive and risk-ridden) on cultivation and cropping pattern in the Valley.

(The data on cropping pattern in Gokilapuram is dealt with further down, in the subsection on the village in the section on main concepts and definitions used in the survey.)

Sources of Employment in the Village :

Gokilapuram is endowed with a combination of natural factors -- relating to climate, soil types, fertility and irrigation and drainage facilities -- greatly suited to the cultivation of paddy. At the harvest of the first paddy crop in 1981-82, paddy production on the better tracts of canal- and tank-irrigated land was about 3.10 tonnes per acre (7.66 tonnes per hectare); over most of the surface-irrigated land, production was 2.50 tonnes per acre (6.16 tonnes per hectare). By way of comparison, in the official estimates from crop-cutting surveys, the standard yield of paddy in kilograms per hectare on all tracts in 1978-79 was 2468 kg for Madurai district and 2017 kg for Tamil Nadu.[1/]

The presence of fertile surface-irrigated land, growing mainly paddy, and of lift-irrigated land with a diversified cropping pattern in contiguous villages, has made for a strong development of the market for hired labour in Gokilapuram as well as in other villages of the Valley; as a consequence, earnings from labouring out play a crucial part in the economy of the overwhelming majority of households.

On paddy land, the demand for labour is sharply peaked. Men are employed for field-wall preparation and bund-cutting and for ploughing (tractor ploughing has replaced male labour and bullock-power substantially on many fields); men and women are employed at basal manuring; the demand for female labour

---

1/ Government of Tamil Nadu, Season and Crop Report, 1978-79, Table VA, p.85.

rises sharply at the time of the first and second weedings (only a few landlords hire labour for a third weeding, and only on some fields); the curve rises higher at the time of transplantation, also a female-dominated operation; the highest point of the demand for hired labour on paddy fields is at harvest time, when male and female labour power is employed. The first threshing of the grain is done manually (the operation requires intense physical effect) by men and women; the second threshing, formerly done by men driving bullocks across the grain, trampling it down, is now largely done by tractor. Irrigation and guarding tasks at the paddy lands are done by a group of irrigation workers (neerpaichi) and guardsmen, agricultural labourers belonging to the Maravar caste, who are chosen annually for the jobs and are paid in paddy at the end of each crop.

An important feature of the system of employment of workers on paddy land is the contract (kothu) system during the transplantation and harvest seasons. During the transplanting season large groups -- of upto 60 -- women get together under a jobber/contractor (kothukarar), generally an agricultural labourer himself, who contracts work for the group from landowners; the work is paid for at a rate per unit of land. The women work from field to field, uprooting seedlings from the nursery, bundling them and transplanting them in the main field, working more intensively than at daily-rated tasks, although setting their own work-hours. (There are, in general, two or three men in each group: their task is to carry seedling bundles from the nursery to the main field and they are paid separately for this.) The workers are paid in cash at the first crop and in paddy at the second; the total earnings from a field are shared equally between all of them and the kothukarar.

In the harvest season, the group consists of men and women: their tasks are to cut the grain, tie it into sheaves and carry the sheaves to the threshing floor or to the

owner's cart or tractor trailer for transporting to the threshing floor. *Kothu* labour is an extremely important source of work for agricultural workers and other labouring sections in the village, and the pressure of an increasing labouring population is making itself felt on the *kothu* every successive year.

On lift-irrigated land, the pattern and intensity of labour absorption is greatly dependent on cropping pattern and methods of cultivation; crucial determinants of the peaks in the demand curve are the number and type of crops planted over an agricultural year. The important sources of employment for men are field-bund and field preparation, including basal manuring; preparing irrigation ditches with hoes; irrigation of fields; clearing fields of plants after harvest; and, in addition, on banana fields: chopping side shoots and dead leaves from the tree. For women, the main tasks are spreading basal manure, weeding, cotton picking, harvesting vegetable and cereal crops and threshing

and winnowing coarse grain. Grape cultivation draws on a group of specialised workers who work most of the year only on grape fields (this is not an important source of employment in Gokilapuram and vineyard workers live mainly in the villages where grape is a more important crop). On banana fields, harvesting is done by workers employed by merchants who buy up the crop; in Gokilapuram, banana harvest workers are brought in trucks from nearby Chinnamanur.

Unirrigated land in the vicinity of the village and in most parts of the Valley is, as may be expected, the least labour-absorbent and the poorest source of employment for workers. The fertile unirrigated groundnut lands of Gudalur in the south and south-west of the Valley, however, are an exception and attract workers from different parts of the district (including Gokilapuram) during the harvest season in August-September.

Tamarind groves in the village and in other parts of the Valley (a few of the major landlord families of Gokilapuram have been major tamarind contractors in the Valley for more than two decades) are an important source of employment after January every year. Men climb the trees and beat the fruit down; women gather the fruit and carry them in baskets for transportation back to the village.

Tasks other than crop production:

The major source of employment at tasks other than crop production based in the village is tamarind processing. Women dry the tamarind fruit and shell it; then, working in large numbers (and often with their children to help them) in sheds or courtyards belonging to tamarind contractors and merchants, they hammer down the fruit, removing its seed and fibre. They are paid by the 10-kilogram weight, the baskets of decorticated and de-fibred fruit being notoriously short-weighed. The tamarind processing work lasts, with varying intensities of employment, for 80 to 90 days.

There is also a cooperative society in the village for hand-pounding of paddy into rice, where about 25 to 30 women are employed; employment here is, of course, subject to seasonal fluctuations.

Plantations on the eastern (Tamil Nadu) and western (Kerala) hills draw off a significant number -- for the Valley as a whole, the number runs into thousands -- of labouring families every year, particularly from Harijan households. In the Cardamom Hills of the west, the old overseer (kankani) system of recruiting workers is being replaced, in response to the demands of a strong trade union movement, by a settled labour force, in which Tamil workers and particularly workers from the Valley are a major component. Workers, most of whom travel with their entire households, work on the cardamom estates for 9 months of the year, returning to the village for 3 months, and sometimes in between for

major festivals. In the east and south east, where the development of cardamom and coffee plantations is more recent and the trade union movement still weak, workers are employed for shorter periods, with little protection of their rights under law.

Some men workers work at well-digging and at public works sites; men and women go to the eastern hills, particularly during the lean season, for bringing down, and sometimes selling, firewood.

Artisanal activity in the village, which is caste based, consists of woodwork (mainly the construction of carts and ploughs), pot-making, and blacksmith work. There are two small blacksmiths' forges in the village: they are mainly engaged in replacing and repairing plough-tips, making small hand-implements and doing the metal-work for carts.

II Objectives of the Paper

The objectives of this paper can be stated briefly enough; they are

- to study the distribution of land holdings and assets of households in the village by size category of ownership and operational holdings and to study the degree of concentration of the distribution of land and asset holdings between households;
- to attempt an economic classification of households in the village; and
- to study the distribution of land holdings and assets among households in these classes and to study the degree of concentration/inequality in land and asset holdings.

III Statement of Method

The primary material for this report is from the results of a survey of households in Gokilapuram village in May 1977.

(i) Main concepts and definitions used:

Household: The basic unit of investigation of the survey was the household. In defining the household, we followed the Census of India and the National Sample Survey (NSS): it was defined as a group of persons normally living together (and normally belonging to the same family) and taking food from a common kitchen. It was assumed that the members of a household do not merely live together, but conduct their occupations and socioeconomic activities together. The classification that we have attempted is also, for the present, a classification of households.

The concept of household, as used in the Census of India and NSS and followed by us in the survey, is a very useful unit of investigation; its definition is also one that respondents related to quickly. Apart from its usefulness as a unit of investigation, the household was also convenient as a unit of classification when we were dealing with size categories of land holdings, asset holdings, details of agricultural production and aggregate incomes. When we attempted an economic classification of households, however, problems arose with using the household as a unit of classification. Single households can -- and in many cases do -- consist of persons with different occupations; correspondingly, the sources of income of its working members may be quite independent and diverse.

Ownership holdings of households: Here we have followed the definition of the NSS -- land held by a household in ownership (with the right of permanent heritable possession) or owner-like possession. Specifically, the household

ownership holding consists of land owned and operated with family and/or hired labour (referred to in certain sources as land under "direct cultivation" or "self cultivation") plus land leased out plus land mortgaged out.

Operational holdings of households: This has been taken to be the land actually operated by -- under the management of -- a household. Specifically, it is the sum of land owned and cultivated with family and/or hired labour, land leased in (for fixed rent or share) and land mortgaged in.

There are seven households out of 650 in the village owning and operating three joint holdings in the village. One holding is owned and operated by three households, the other two holdings by two households each.

Irrigation-based classification of land: Of great significance in the Cumbum Valley is the distinction between three types of cultivation, with the source of irrigation as the major determinant. The implications of such a classification relate to distinct variations in the scale and type of cultivation: including, for instance, in the number and variety of crops grown on the land and methods of cultivation employed to produce them, in the degree to which the productivity of labour has developed and the intensity and forms of employment of agricultural labour, and in the extent to which the produce of the land is sold on the market.

Well entrenched in popular perception, the classification is as follows:

Nanjai, or fields that are actually irrigated by canals and tanks. (We emphasize that this refers to land actually under surface irrigation and not merely those lands registered in revenue records as "wet".) Of the nanjai land in the taluk, all but the nanjai in the vicinity of Bodinayakanur is part of the Periyar system, the canal and tank system that irrigates

14784 acres in the Cumbum Valley section (that is, in tracts above the Vaigai dam), which is the first and best served section of the Periyar ayacut. The Valley generally receives releases of Periyar water from June 1 to end February, which makes for a double paddy crop.

The predominant crop on nanjai is HYV paddy, a large part of which goes to the market. In some of the lower-lying villages, betel, sugar cane and other minor crops are grown, although on a small scale. Some paddy lands are planted with fodder and manure crops during the dry season.

Punjai, or unirrigated, rainfed land or land that "looks up to the sky."1/ The quality of punjai land in the Valley varies : from the more productive groundnut and sesamum growing punjai lands in the south of the Valley near Gudalur, on which cultivation has acquired a substantial degree of commercialisation, to -- what is the most familiar type of punjai -- the dry and low-yielding lands located, for example, to the east of Gokilapuram. In such tracts punjai represents the backward, traditional sector of agriculture. In years when the rain fails, agriculture on these tracts is reduced to being pursued as traditional craft, near a state of ruin -- the soil is scratched with a plough, seeds broadcast and little care taken of the crop until the time comes for a meagre harvest. Households whose landholdings consist entirely of small punjai plots must allot their labour-time elsewhere -- generally to labouring out for others -- for subsistence. As we have seen for the taluk as a whole, the crops grown on punjai are generally coarse grains of traditional varieties -- cholam, ragi, varagu, samai and irungucholam and on some fields, unirrigated groundnut. Cumbu is also grown, particularly in the Bodinayakanur block. Pulses are planted as intercrops.

1/ "வானம் பார்த்த பூமி"

Thottam, lift-irrigated or garden land, where wells are the source of irrigation. As with the rest of the taluk, the thottam lands in and around Gokilapuram are planted with a diversifying variety of commercial crops, such as banana, cotton, h.y.v. and traditional cholam and ragi, vegetables, chilli and fruit, cultivated on a increasingly intensive scale.

While there are variations within these three types that have to do with the quality and reliability of irrigation (particularly important in the case of thottam), soil types and fertility and the location and topography of fields, these are secondary to the main nanjai-punjai-thottam classification, which helps to stamp cultivation (and the landlords that dominate different sectors of cultivation) with distinct labels.

Our survey also covered thope - or land on which tree crops are raised. This included coconut groves, tamarind groves and also some groves planted with fruit (mainly mango and jackfruit) trees.

The Village: The basic unit of revenue administration, the revenue village, is the village unit used in most official surveys. The WAC is recomputed from revenue records; the Census of India 1971 and 1981 in general deal with the revenue village; and the NSS, for purposes of sample stratification, uses the revenue village. In Gokilapuram, the panchayat and revenue villages coincide; this gives us the advantage of making village level data from the Censuses of India 1961 and 1971 comparable.[1/]

1/ The Census of India 1961 provided data for panchayat villages in the District Census Handbooks. In order to provide comparability between the data for villages in 1961 and 1971, the Census of India 1971 gives taluk-wise lists of the location code numbers of each village and town in 1971, with location code numbers for the same village or town for 1961 given alongside. However, when the village- and town-wise returns for the Valley were actually compared using the conversion table given in the 1971 District Census Handbooks, there was a divergence (of varying degrees of magnitude) in the area of villages at the two Censuses for a significant number of villages.

Our survey covered households actually resident in Gokilapuram village. The Census of India 1971 records that the number of households resident in the village was 733. Our survey covers 650 households in the village (the actual number was 652; two schedules were discarded because the data were unreliable). Among the omissions in the survey were three landlord households (one referred to give us an interview, the other two always managed to slip out on us on the many occasions that we took unfilled or partially-filled schedules to interview them), one prominent trader household and some agricultural labourer-cum-plantation worker households that left the village for the estates during the course of the survey period. For statistical purposes, the 650 households covered by the survey are considered the population of the village, and not a sample.

The important consequence of covering the households resident in the village is that the ownership and operational holdings of households covered by the survey lie in the revenue village of Gokilapuram and in adjacent revenue villages, chiefly in Anamalaiyanpatti (across the canal and to the east of Gokilapuram) and Uthamapalayam village, whose nanjai lands lie to the west of Gokilapuram. The survey does not cover the household economies of households resident outside Gokilapuram village who have holdings in the revenue jurisdiction of the village.

Consequently, our survey appears to have managed to take a cross-sectional snapshot, one that approximates rather better the irrigation regime and cropping pattern of the Valley as a whole, while at the same time not being complete in its coverage of the agricultural land of an overwhelmingly nanjai-dominated revenue village, as the sown area of Gokilapuram revenue village is.

Thus, in the revenue returns for Gokilapuram for 1980-81, out of a total net sown area of 766 acres (current fallows, given separately, are recorded as 82 acres), the

area under irrigation is 718 acres, or 93.73 per cent of net sown area. Of the irrigated area, 685 acres or 95.40 per cent is under surface irrigation -- nanjai land -- and 33.60 acres is under well-irrigation. This gives the following break-up for the total net sown area into irrigation types:

Table 10: Net Sown Area by Irrigation Type, Gokilapuram Village

(Source: Revenue records, 1980-81)

Irrigation-type (1)	Acres (2)	(2) As per cent of column Total (3)
Nanjai	685	89.43
Punjai	48	6.26
Thottam	33	4.31
Net Sown Area	766	100.00

Our survey coverage is as follows:

Table 11 : Irrigation-type Landholdings of Households Resident in Gokilapuram

	Ownership Holdings		Operational Holdings	
	Area (acres)	% of column total	Area (acres)	% of column total
Nanjai	174.99	22.20	202.21	23.87
Punjai	464.41	58.91	455.83	53.81
Thottam	148.88	18.89	189.14	22.32
All holdings	788.28	100.00	847.18	100.00

Thus while the total extent of holdings covered by the survey coincides roughly with the total net sown area and current fallows of the revenue records for the village, in the survey there is a preponderance of punjai and a significant thottam sector, both of which are features more representative of the Valley as a whole.

Similarly, in respect of the cropping pattern of Gokilapuram in revenue village in 1980-81, the revenue records cover two field crops, paddy and cholam and two tree crops, tamarind and coconut, with paddy covering 94.41 per cent of the gross cropped area. (Irrigation and cropping patterns in the revenue village have remained substantially the same in the revenue village over the decade.) Per contra, in the survey data, paddy occupies 39.31 per cent of gross cropped area; unirrigated coarse grain and unirrigated groundnut 39.25 per cent of gross cropped area; and other irrigated crops, grown on thottam (including coarse grains, banana, cotton, vegetables, some groundnut and one plot on which grape is grown) 21.38 per cent of gross cropped area. (see Table 12)

Table 12 : Cropping Pattern : Gokilapuram Village 1976-77

Crop	Percentage of total gross cropped area under crop
Paddy	39.31
Other Cereals (Unirrigated)	38.67
Other Cereals (Irrigated)	7.23
Banana	3.05
Cotton	4.55
Vegetables	5.07
Groundnut (Irrigated)	1.33
Groundnut (Unirrigated)	0.58
Others	0.21

Note: i) The table covers gross cropped area under field crops and not tree (perennial) crops.
ii) Pulses, except on 0.60 acres, are intercropped, and are not dealt with separately.

However, it must also be noted that of the total gross value of production of field crops in the survey (crops are valued at the average price received during the reference year), paddy accounts for 61.81 per cent; punjai crops (other cereals, groundnut and all pulses) for only 4.23 per cent, and other irrigated crops (all of which, except one 3.60 acre plot of cotton grown on nanjai, are grown on thottam), 33.96 per cent. (see Table 13)

Table 13

Crop	Value of production of individual field crop as per cent of value of production of all field crops in Gokilapuram
Paddy	61.81
Other cereals (unirrigated)	2.60
Other cereals (irrigated)	3.29
Banana	11.90
Cotton	9.76
Vegetables	6.86
Groundnut (unirrigated)	0.50
Groundnut (irrigated)	0.86
Grape	1.29
All pulses and others	1.13

It is apparent that while punjai predominates in the landholdings of households resident in the village, paddy production on nanjai is far and away the largest component of the total value of gross production of field crops. While the survey data presents us with a more varied agronomic canvas then the near unbroken nanjai landscape of the revenue village (and is therefore more characteristic of the varied agricultural types in the Valley as a whole), we note that

the survey village must also be differentiated from the more backward villages where punjai cultivation is dominant and from those where lift irrigation has pushed forward a great deal and thottam is the overwhelmingly dominant sector of field cultivation.

Since our data covers the economy of households in the village, it follows also that it takes into account the labouring out of households wherever they labour out during the reference period. While most of the labouring out is in Gokilapuram and contiguous villages, workers also work in areas further out in the Valley: for example, during the tamarind harvest season and the groundnut harvest season. During the latter season, workers leave the village in groups under a contractor, pitch camp in and around Gudalur and Lower Camp in the south of the Valley near where the Periyar enters the plains, and remain there till the end of the groundnut harvest, working for about a month in a good year. Non agricultural tasks, particularly plantation work and also including tasks of shorter duration, such as road-work or well-digging, also take workers out of the village.

Another feature of the survey village is that the bulk of the punjai and thottam holdings covered by the survey lies to the east of the canal. Much of it is in the revenue precincts of Anamalaiyanpatti, but there are plots that go almost uptil Erasakkanayakanur in the east. The land east of the canal was part of the territory of the erstwhile zamindari estate of Erasakkanayakanur, and was converted to ryotwari only after the settlement of the late 1950s and early 1960s. The nanjai land is part of the Periyar tract and has been ryotwari territory from the last century.

(ii) <u>Survey method and survey period</u>:

The actual task of surveying the village was the effort of 16 persons. Four persons did a pilot survey and pretested the questionnaire in April 1977. Sixteen persons worked for

about two weeks from May 15, 1977; a smaller number among us stayed on, filling and checking schedules until the end of June 1977. Four persons went back to the village for about 3 weeks to correct discrepancies that had appeared in the course of computation.

The survey was a census-type survey of households, with one schedule[1/] being used for each household. An effort was made to identify the actual head of each household, and the main respondent was generally the best-informed member of the household. Generally, however, most of the members of a household were present when the interviewers (we generally went to households in pairs although sometimes, particularly in the later stages when some experience had been gained, we worked singly) came round to their household for interviews; this was particularly useful when we recorded the labour schedules of individual household members.

1/ In the 10-page schedule used in the survey, the major items of information elicited from households in the survey relate to : family size, caste, age structure, and educational level and occupation of each household member; land owned and operated by the household, tenancy for fixed rent and share; production and costs of production on the household operational holding, including data on irrigation, major inputs, means of production owned or hired, livestock and employment of family and hired labour by crop and agricultural operation; marketing of agricultural produce; income from business activity other than agriculture; labouring out at agricultural and non agricultural tasks and wage earnings; agricultural and non-agricultural assets; indebtedness; and consumption.

As it turned out, the more reliable data related to land holdings; tenancy; production, marketing and labouring details; income and earnings and assets. The less reliable data related, expectedly, to indebtedness and to consumption.

As investigators, we worked from early morning till late in the evening (though often investigators had to work late into the night); two persons worked at checking the schedules and one or two at taking detailed case studies of the life histories of individual respondents chosen in the course of schedule surveys. The duration of each interview varied: an individual who had a single source of nonagricultural income as the sole source of total earnings took a minimum of 45 minutes, while a peasant household with an operational holding as well as agricultural and nonagricultural labouring out would take a few hours. One big landlord household, where the interview was frequently interrupted, and the head of the household took a great deal of time in answering each question, the schedule took a total of about seven hours to complete.

There were, of course, problems of concealment, particularly by richer households, of sources and levels of income and of assets and their value. In cases where a discrepancy appeared to interviewers between the obvious material status of a household and the data that the head of household had provided in the interview, and in cases where schedule data were internally inconsistent, we checked the sources and levels of income of the household and the kind of assets it owned with other persons who were well-informed about the household, and then went back to the household to re-interview it in respect of the suspect items of data and correct, as best as possible, the schedule. (In cases where it occurred, one item of data that was particularly difficult to rectify was the level of income of a household from money-lending.) We also checked back the entire body of data on landholdings of households with the karnam and some others -- old and experienced agricultural labourers were particularly helpful in this task.

After the first few days, when investigators had spread themselves out and the survey was known of throughout the village, the response of the people was, in the great majority of cases, detailed and helpful and greatly encouraging and instructive for the investigators. Each investigator had accounts of households that received them with hospitality, answered their questions with care and, on occasion, of working people who helped to persuade neighbours to help investigators out by being at home when they came around with their schedules.

(iii) Reference Period

For items of data that relate to the working year -- crop production, costs, labour schedules, income and earnings of households, marketing behaviour and consumption -- the reference period of the survey is the agricultural year 1976-77. For items of data that relate to a point of time -- land holdings, asset holdings, debt position, family size and age structure -- the reference period is the date of the survey generally between May 15, 1977 and June 15, 1977.

IV Methods of Classification of Households

i) Standard Classification : by size category of ownership and operational holdings:

The standard method of classification of households, used in the WAC, NSS and in the Census of India 1961 is by size category of land holdings. The distribution of land, the primary prerequisite for production in agriculture, between households is an important indicator of their position in the system of agrarian production. Land is clearly a fundamental asset -- 61.36 per cent of the value of all assets in the village are constituted by the value of crop land and thope land.

The potential usefulness of data for households indexed by the size of their landholdings as a measure of the economic size of the production unit is, however, subject to important limitations; these have been discussed elsewhere.[1]

To summarise the arguments in the sources cited, a single size category of land holding may conceal considerable variations in the physical characteristics of land -- variations, for instance, in the irrigation and drainage facilities available to the land, the type of soil and its fertility, land utilisation and cropping pattern and so on. A single size category of land holding may group together households that differ in respect of key characteristics. The terms of possession of a holding may vary widely within a size category of land holding. A single size category can encompass on the one hand households which have made considerable technical improvements upon the land, have adopted advanced techniques of cultivation, incur heavy expenditure during the crop season and receive regular surpluses from the land, and on the other, households whose methods of cultivation are still backward and which still practise agriculture as routine craft. A single size category may conceal differences in the sources -- agricultural and nonagricultural -- of incomes of households. Considerable variations are likely to exist in the assets -- land assets, agricultural machinery and implements, livestock and nonagricultural assets -- owned by households within a single size category of land holding. Further, given that technical change penetrates agriculture in varied forms, the size of land holding need not be a direct indicator of the scale of production in agriculture. An index of land holdings *per se* does not take up the crucial question of the physical

---

1/ See Utsa Patnaik, "Economics of Farm Size and Farm Scale : Some Assumptions Re-examined," *Economic and Political Weekly*, Special Number, August 1972, and for official data on landholdings in Tamil Nadu, MIDS Data Series No.1, *A Note on Official Sources of Data on Landholdings in Tamil Nadu*.

participation of members of households in cultivation; of the relationship, household by household, between labour hired and labour expended by the household and the character and conditions of such labour.

It is clear then that the size of land holding in terms of its physical extent cannot be (and as agriculture modernises, may become less and less) a precise and accurate measure of the <u>economic</u> size of the farming unit. And in a situation such as that of the Cumbum Valley, where agriculture is being fairly rapidly transformed and modernised (despite unevenness in development and the persistence of significant sectors of backward agriculture), where the introduction of new technology has become a striking feature of the agrarian scene, the gross size of holding is an index that cannot, on its own, capture the nuances of the <u>type</u> and <u>scale</u> of cultivation, which become crucial factors in determining agrarian relations.

We have, however, done a first classification of data for households by size categories of ownership and operational holdings -- in the first place, this makes for comparison with other sources of data. Classification of data on a continuous quantitative scale, in this case by size categories of land holdings, also makes the data amenable to further statistical computation.

A note on the actual size classes used in the tables: in the Valley, the traditional units of land measurement of nanjai are <u>kuzhi</u> and <u>sey</u>. Four kuzhi (one kuzhi = 0.60 acres) make one <u>sey</u> (= 2.40 acres). On punjai and thottam, land is measured in <u>kuzhi</u> (punjai and thottam are not measured in <u>sey</u>). One <u>kuzhi</u>, then, is approximately 0.25 hectares (which is about 0.62 acres) and one <u>sey</u> roughly a hectare (2.47 acres). The lower subdivisions used in the classification of land holdings, of 0.25 hectares/0.62 acres, approximate the <u>kuzhi</u> measurement of the village.

(ii) <u>Economic Classification of Households</u>:

Clearly, the method of classification of households is an important factor in the usefulness of the analysis of distribution of land and asset holdings. From the data on households in the village, we have attempted an economic classification of households, based on the ownership of the means of production by a household, the extent to which it earns its livelihood through the manual labour of its members and the type of occupation it pursues. We have classified households in the following manner:

1. <u>Major landlords</u>: Landlords are those who own and control the largest land holdings in the village, but do not participate in the major manual operations on the land, depending entirely on the labour of others for their living. In Gokilapuram, their lands are worked, above all, by hired -- predominantly wage -- labour; some of them lease out small plots of land and their tenants are often persons who do odd jobs for the landlord and help in the management of "self-cultivated" land. Landlords also draw upon various forms of semi-free labour and extract labour services, although to a relatively small and diminishing extent at agricultural tasks, from agricultural workers.

Major landlord households are a distinct section -- they are set off from the others by the level of land holdings of each household and by the very high relative level of assets and income of each household. In addition, each major landlord household derives income from tope land and plantation land and some from varied sources of business activity other than agriculture.

Of the 11 major landlord households, four are Mar[illegible]ar households. Each of these has a traditionally established place in the landholding structure of the village: the holding of a household today has its origins in land holdings that

can be traced to family holdings held by many successive generations in the village. The Maravars are, by popular account, the caste that originally established the village, and the largest landowners among them have held a specific position of dominance in the socio-political life of the village.

The other 7 households among the major landlords belong to the Telugu Chettiar caste. They are the richest section among the major landlords, whose income from the land is considerably supplemented by income from business activity.

> Two of these households (the heads of households are first cousins) have had traditional holdings in the area; their land was, uptil about the mid-sixties, largely cultivated by tenants who paid the landlords a fixed rent. These two households have since acquired more land, particularly nanjai, of which they now have the largest holdings among households resident in the village. They are also the richest households in the village, deriving income from relatively new sources of business income in addition to income from crop land, thope and plantation land: from retail outlets for the sale of furniture, electrical goods and hardware and from financial assets. One household has a lucrative dealership for the sale of Texmo pumpsets.
>
> One among the Telugu Chettiar major landlords has had punjai and thottam holdings (by our schedules) for at least 50 years. At least two previous generations were involved in merchant activity in addition to agriculture; the father of the present head of household did business in, among other things, gold. The household today has also a plot of nanjai leased in from a big merchant relative resident outside the village. The household leases out a part of its thottam holding, and in addition to incomes from thope and plantation land, is in the tamarind trade.

-- The other four households from among the Chettiars are descended from a common household. The common ancestor was engaged, in the 1920s and 1930s, in petty merchant activity of diverse types; the big breakthrough for the family came with its entry into the tamarind trade in the village and surrounding areas in the Valley. During this period, the family also began to invest the money gained from business activity in the purchase of punjai (much of this has been converted into thottam) and small plots of nanjai. Today the four households that have branched out from the common household are -- although later entrants into land ownership and control -- among the largest and richest landowners in the village.1/

Most of the households from among Chettiar landlords are well into the hunt for land; as is clear, their inherited holdings are being augmented through purchase and mortgage (often being completely transferred through foreclosure).

2. Medium landlords: Members of medium landlord households also do not participate in the major manual operations on the land that they own and control; the level of income and assets of each household is, however, distinctly lower and the sources of income much less diverse than the households in category (1). The core of the land holdings of households in this group (with one exception, noted later) are inherited holdings (which, in the process of inheritance, have diminished in size through subdivision); five households have purchased land over the past three decades (two households have bought punjai, two small plots of nanjai and two have bought thottam over the period, of which one household has purchased punjai and thottam). All the households in the group gain income from holdings of thope land and five from small plantation

---

1/ We do not have sufficient information on the record of these households, particularly Chettiar households, in money lending. We note, however, that some members of these households are engaged in pawn broking.

holdings. There is also among these households one Chettiar household that is active in the tamarind trade, although with a turnover that is lower than that of the tamarind merchants among the major landlords.

One household that has been included in the group for purposes of convenience of classification, is different from the others: it is a well-to-do capitalist farmer household which, strictly speaking, should not fall within a classification of "landlords". This household has only punjai and thottam holdings, and these holdings were obtained through purchase in the period after 1960. No member of the household participates in manual labour on the land, which is entirely cultivated by hired labour.

3. Non-labouring small landholders: These are households that belong to families that have traditionally held nanjai land in the village. The inherited land holdings are now subdivided between successive generations and for a variety of reasons, while their households are not ruined, they have not really stemmed the rot, and now live mostly off the income from diminished land holdings. Only two among the 11 households in this category reported purchase of land in the past three decades: one purchased a plot of nanjai and the other of punjai over the period. On the other hand, three households reported sale of nanjai over the same period, four households sold punjai land and two households thottam.

Members of these households do not do not do any manual work; there is also no significant diversification of sources of income among these households. Some of them have comparatively high assets; apart from the value of land, these consist mainly of the old family house and its appurtenances.

When classifying the households in the previous three categories, we relied mainly on information gained from:

-- quantitiative data in the schedules on land holdings, income, assets, renting of land and the employment of labour and on other aspects of the household economy;

-- notes taken during the interview on the past status of households: particularly the entries on land holdings in earlier periods and the part of present holdings that were acquired through inheritance and the notes on the socio-economic status of the household in previous generations;

-- case studies of individual landlord households; and

-- the impressions and information we gained from being in the village and learning about the status of individual families in the life of the village.

4. <u>The Peasantry</u>: Peasant households are demarcated from landlord households by the fact that their members work, in varying degree, at the major manual operations on the land that they operate. As a group, the peasantry is a marked by considerable heterogeneity in the socioeconomic status of its constituent households; it is a group stratified into different classes.

We have mentioned earlier that the economy of the overwhelming majority of households in Gokilapuram is marked by a high degree of labouring out. It is also marked by a substantial requirement of hired labour in cultivation by different sections of the peasantry, of which we give some examples from cultivation on nanjai and thottam.

On nanjai, a peasant does not do irrigation or guarding tasks; these are performed by a group of agricultural labourers chosen annually by nanjai cultivators. With the development of a new form of labour organisation (the contract system) for

transplanting and harvest tasks, in the transplanting reason most peasants and in the harvest season virtually all of them, let their land out to contract groups for transplantation and harvesting the crop. (Our field notes for 1981-82 included even small peasants with nanjai holdings of 0.30 acres, half a kuzhi, that employed hired labour on contract for transplantation and harvesting.) Given the need for intensive care of an h.y.v. paddy crop (in terms of requirements of labour and modern fertiliser and pesticide inputs) and the gradual decline of the institution of exchange labour, many peasants also employ hired workers for ploughing, weeding and even threshing the paddy crop.

In the case of a peasant household that operates thottam, whether the household grows irrigated foodgrain, or whether the household (by cutting on consumption and scraping together funds, or borrowing or taking advances on the crop) is able to diversify or alter its crop mix and plant banana, vegetable crops or cotton -- the peasant household requires a substantial input of hired labour in addition to its family labour, particularly for weeding and harvesting, but also for field preparation and forming irrigation channels.

Given these requirements of hired labour, and the fact of possibilities for employment as agricultural labourers in an area of modernising and diversifying agriculture, many peasant households send out men and women to take the advantage possible from employment opportunities at agricultural and other tasks, and work as hired labourers for wages on the land of others, in order at least partially to compensate for expenses incurred by the household on rising costs of production (and in many cases on the payment of rent to landlords) and to augment household income. In seeking opportunities for labouring out, households look to agricultural labour and also tasks other than crop production -- to tamarind processing, rice-pounding and other occupations in and around the village.

Taking into consideration the pressures on a peasant household in the context of a modernising, increasingly capitalist, agriculture, and the phenomenon of substantial labouring out by households, we have attempted a first classification of households on the basis of what we shall call a labour-ratio.

In the numerator we have taken the *sum* of the number of days of family labour of households (labour days of men and women in the household spent in crop production on the operational holding of the household), the number of days spent at labouring out by members of the household at tasks connected with crop production (or *agricultural tasks*), and the number of days of labouring out by members of the household at tasks other than crop production (or *nonagricultural tasks*).1/ In the denominator we have taken the number of person-days of hired manual labour employed by the household on its operational holding. The resultant ratio measures the relationship between the total number of manual labour days performed by a household and the total number of days of hired labour that they employ.

On this basis, peasant households have been classified as follows:

(1) households with l-ratio $> 0 < 0.249$
(2) households with l-ratio from 0.250 to 0.749
(3) households with l-ratio from 0.750 to 1.249
(4) households with l-ratio from 1.250 to 1.999
(5) households with l-ratio from 2.000 to 4.999
(6) households with l-ratio > 5.00

The ratio attempts to incorporate the core -- without entering into its complexity or detail -- of the Marxist-Leninist understanding of classes in the countryside by classifying peasant households on the basis of a *labour*

1/ The numerator is the aggregate of the number of days of labour of the family, irrespective of family size.

criterion : the relationship between the manual labour days expended by members of a household to the number of person days of manual labour employed by them.[1] The ratio also attempts to take into account the fact of a significant degree of labouring out, not only by agricultural labourers and poor peasants (who constitute the bulk of the labour force in the village) but also by wider sectionsof the working peasantry.

We note specifically that in the numerator of our labour ratio, we have added days of family labour to days of labouring out. In Mao Zedong's classical definition of classes in the pre-liberation Chinese countryside, a sharp difference is made between labouring on one's own holdings and working out for others. We have, in preceding paragraphs, attempted to explain why, in the particular conditions figuring in our study, it could be misleading to erect a barrier between the family labour of a household and the number of days it spends at labouring out. In particular, the middle and poorer sections of the peasantry have to compensate for relatively high absolute levels of hiring in labour by labouring out, often intensively, and it would be difficult in these conditions to make the fact of labouring out by households the criterion by which these sections are demarcated. However, we also note that as the labour-ratio for households decline, in general so also do the second and third components of the numerator, which relate to labouring out; among households at the top, whose labour-ratio is very low, labouring out, predictably, tends to, or is, zero. (For landlord households, of course, the entire numerator would be zero; we have not however, used the ratio for landlord households.)

An important part of the classical definitions of classes in the countryside relates to the material status of households -- the income levels of landlords, rich peasants, middle peasants and poor peasants play an important role in determining their class status.

1/ The following brief list of the classic works on the differentiation of the peasantry is well known: V.I. Lenin, The Development of Capitalism in Russia, in Collected Works, Volume III, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1972, particularly Chapters 2 and 3; Lenin, "Preliminary Draft Theses on the Agrarian Question", Collected Works, Volume XXXI, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974; Mao Zedong, "Analysis of Classes in Chinese Society" and "How to Differentiate the Classes in the Rural Areas", in Selected Works, Volume I, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1965.

contd...

While it is true of our data also that across all households, there is an inverse relationship between income levels and the labour ratio, there are significant sections in the middle who actually attempt to enhance household earnings by labouring out, and we have felt that it would considerably distort the picture if in a first classification we attempted to impose such an inverse relationship on the data for all peasant households.

With the qualification that the numerator of the labour-ratio includes family labour as well as labouring out, we note that <u>in respect of a labour criterion alone</u>, households in classes 4(1) and 4(2), whose own labour is less than 75 per cent of the labour that they hire for work on their land, correspond to the classical definition of the rich peasantry, whose own labour is less than the labour they employ and for whom reliance on the labour of others is of a compact character. The next category, 4(3), whose labour-ratio is within the range 1 $\pm$ 0.250, corresponds to the middle peasantry, whose own labour is roughly equal to the days of labour that they employ. The manual labour of households in 4(4), 4(5) and 4(6) is more than 125 per cent of the labour that they employ, and these correspond to different sections, gradations, of a semiproletarianised poor peasantry.

The next two categories are

5. Agricultural labourers

(1) a. who own and operate land
b. who operate, but do not own land
c. who own, but do not operate land

(2) who neither own nor operate land.

6. Nonagricultural labourers

(1) who own and/or operate land

(2) who neither own nor operate land.

---

f.n. contd...

Among the contributions to the Indian academic literature on differentiation in which specific criteria for assessing differentiation are proposed are P. Sundarayya, "Class Differentiation of the Peasantry: Results of Rural Surveys in Andhra Pradesh", <u>Social Scientist</u>, Nos. 56 and 57, March and April 1977; and Utsa Patnaik, "Class Differentiation within the Peasantry: An Approach to Analysis of Indian Agriculture", <u>Economic and Political Weekly</u>, Review of Agriculture, September 1976.

Classes 5 and 6 both consist of households whose earnings are mainly or exclusively from manual labour. Class 5 consists of households whose manual labour includes tasks at crop production (agricultural labour); class 6 consists of those whose manual labour is exclusively at tasks other than crop production (nonagricultural labour). It must be noted straight away that this tends to underestimate those whose main occupation is nonagricultural labour. This was a problem that was difficult to avoid: given the fact that our data related to the labouring pattern of households for only a single agricultural year, it would have been arbitrary to have classified a household that worked, say, 50 days at agricultural tasks and 51 days at nonagricultural tasks as a "nonagricultural labour household." In order to avoid attempting to establish an arbitrary cut-off point for distinguishing agricultural and nonagricultural manual labour, we decided to classify as agricultural manual labourers those who had, during the reference year, exercised the option of working as hired labourers at agricultural tasks, despite the fact that in the aggregate, this would involve an underestimate of households that worked mainly at nonagricultural tasks. (This problem shall be partly offset when we prepare and present tables on the labouring patterns -- agricultural and nonagricultural -- of households.)

Class 5 has been further subdivided into 4 subgroups. Classes 5(1)a and 5(1)b are households which have operational holdings. These holdings are generally small and unproductive; of the 30 households in 5(1)a, 29 operate only small punjai plots and of the 17 households in 5(1)b, 16 operate only punjai. We have not included these households in 4(6) because their labour ratio would be absurdly high -- the values of the first component of the numerator, family labour, and of the denominator, hired labour, are, in absolute terms, low.

7. <u>Household with main income from business activity other than agriculture</u>:

(1) which own and/or operate land
(2) which neigher own nor operate land

Many households in the village earn incomes from entrepreneurial activity outside the direct process of crop production. We have mentioned the business incomes of the major landlord families; from other households as well, persons attempt to take advantage of possibilities for small entrepreneurship. Most of them operate from a low capital base, working, by way of illustration, as contractors for thope produce, as retail sellers of fruit or dry provisions, as small tea-shop owners, at parboiling paddy on a small commercial basis, as itinerant vendors of cloth, fruit and other commodities, at selling fruit or sweets near the gates to the village schools, and so on. On a larger scale, one household has a small rice mill, another owned a brick kiln, another an eating-place at Cumbum, a fourth runs a chit fund. Of the households in the village, 12.31 per cent derive the overwhelmingly large proportion of their incomes from such activity; they comprise class 7.

8. <u>Households whose major earnings are from artisanal activity or work at traditional caste calling</u>:

(1) which own and/or operate land
(2) which neither own nor operate land.

These include households whose major income is from woodwork and blacksmith work (they belong to the Achari caste), potmaking (belonging to the potmaker* caste) and washing clothes (the Vannar caste). There are also some

----

*called variously Kullalar, Vellalar Chettiar, Kusavar

scheduled caste households in this group -- one household does leather work and works at the task of preparing corpses for funerals in the village; a few others work as village servants, at tasks which have been traditionally assigned to families of their caste. Many households from traditional artisanal castes, particularly from among the pot-makers and Acharis, belong to the peasantry and to the class that covers the largest number of castes, that of agricultural labourers and to other classes; in this group we have included only those households whose major earnings are from artisanal activity or work at traditional caste callings.

9. Households whose main earnings are from salaried persons and professionals:

These include households whose major earnings are from the salaries of school teachers, clerks, petty government functionaries and shop assistants. There is, incidentally, one lawyer in the village, who did not live in the village at the time of the survey, and one doctor with an MBBS, who now practises at Madras -- neither are included in the survey data.

10. Households whose main or sole income is derived from small rents, from remittances, old age pensions, etc.:

These households, generally comprised of elderly persons or with women as heads of households, live substantially on small rents, on remittances from relatives employed outside the village or on pensions under the Old Age Pension Scheme.

11. Unclassified:

Seven households, or 1.08 per cent of all households, have been left unclassified. These are households where there are overlapping functions, which are difficult to classify in any one of the preceding categories.

To restate the point, our classification is one that is derived from the data base of a survey that related to a single reference year; it is based on criteria that have to do, inter alia, with the labouring patterns of households and their occupational status.

There remain, of course, significant differences in detail in the characteristics of households in each group and of nuance in the character of their household economies -- these relate, among other things, to the extent and type of land that they own and operate; the tenurial status of their holdings; the crop pattern that households have adopted and the particular features of production during the reference year; the asset structure of households; the number of working males and females in each household and the age structure of members of the household; the levels and sources of income of households; their caste and the pattern of their labour; the 'freeness' of their labour and the extent of labour services that they perform; and to their debt and consumption levels. The inter-relationships between these factors and their relative weight in the socio-economic activity of the household require greater and more detailed study (supplemented by the data from case studies that attempts to tap the richness of detail that emerges in the study of the individual case).

Table 14 (next page) dealing with the classwise distribution of households, is a self-explanatory first table, and we shall make only a few notes. The major landlord households constitute 1.69 per cent of all households: major and medium landlords together constitute 3.23 per cent. Group 4, comprising the whole peasantry, consists of 104 households, or 16 per cent of all households. Of these, 104 households, 40.38 per cent (or 6.46 per cent of all households) belong to the upper echelons of the peasantry, classes 4(1) and 4(2); there is a slim middle, consisting of 7.69 per cent of households in group 4 (1.23 per cent of all households in the village);

Table 14 : Distribution of Households in Gokilapuram Village, by Economic Classification of Households

Class	Number of Households	Per cent of column Total
1. Major Landlords	11	1.69
2. Medium Landlords	10	1.54
3. Nonlabouring Small landholders	11	1.69
4. Peasants		
(1) 1 ≤ 0.249	23	3.54
(2) 0.250 - 0.749	19	2.92
(3) 0.750 - 1.249	8	1.23
(4) 1.259 - 1.999	16	2.46
(5) 2.000 - 4.999	26	4.00
(6) > 5.000	12	1.85
5. Agricultural Labourers		
(1) a. with own & operational holdings	30	4.62
b. with operational, but no own holdings	17	2.62
c. with own, but no operational holdings	14	2.15
(2) with neither own nor operational holdings	257	39.54
6. Nonagricultural Labourers		
(1) with own and/or operational holdings	8	1.23
(2) with neither own nor operational holdings	21	3.23
7. Main income from business activity other than agriculture		
(1) with own and/or operational holdings	23	3.54
(2) with neither own nor operational holdings	57	8.77

contd..

Class	Number of Households	Per cent of column Total
8. Main earnings from artisanal activity, work at traditional caste calling		
(1) with own and/or operational holdings	13	2.00
(2) with neither own nor operational holdings	23	3.54
9. Main earnings from salaried persons, professionals		
(1) with own and/or operational holdings	9	1.38
(2) with neither own nor operational holdings	24	3.69
10. Main income from small rents, remittances, old age pensions, etc.		
(1) with own and/or operational holdings	5	0.77
(2) with neither own nor operational holdings	6	0.92
11. Unclassified	7	1.08
All Households	650	100.00

are households that correspond to the poor peasantry: whose days of own manual labour is at least 125 per cent of the days of labour that they hire.

The most numerous class of all is that of agricultural labourers, constituting 48.93 per cent of all households; their numbers, from Census data and from material collected in the survey, have been steadily rising. Of them, 80.82 per cent of households in class 5 and 39.54 per cent of all households in the village, are completely landless. Manual labourers as a whole (classes 5 and 6) constitute 53.39 per cent of all households.

Class 7 consists, significantly, of 80 households or 12.31 per cent of all households in the village. Taken together with the fact that households in other classes also derive income (although subsidiary) from business activity other than agriculture, the data indicate that in the context of the increasingly commercialised agriculture of the region, a significant number of households are taking to forms of entrepreneurship -- in the majority of cases, petty business ventures -- outside direct crop production as major or augmentary/subsidiary sources of household income and earnings.

Table 15 (see appendix of tables) deals with the caste composition of households by economic category. Table 16 gives the castes in ranked order, by number of households in each caste. Our attempt here is to give a first report on the distribution of castes among households of different economic categories; we note that the important question of the deeper inter-relationships between caste and class status require more detailed study and are outside the scope of this paper.

Here again, the table ~~and diagram are~~ is self-explanatory and we shall make only brief notes.

Working row-wise, class by class, the 11 major landlord households are divided between the two major upper castes of the village, 4 Maravar and 7 Telugu Chettiar; of the medium landlord households, which are also exclusively Maravar and Chettiar, 9 out of 10 are Maravar. Traditional Maravar landlord households, that no longer occupy the positions they once did, also form the largest number of households in the category of nonlabouring small landholders -- 6 out of 11 households. In group 4 as a whole, Maravar households (all Maravar households constitute 28.92 of all households in the village) constitute 44.23 per cent of households; they are followed by Kallar households, who form 25 per cent of households in group 4; and households belonging to the scheduled

Table 16

Caste	Proportion of households in individual castes to all households, Gokilapuram: 1977
Maravar	28.92
Pallar	15.23
Kallar	11.69
Telegu Chettiar	10.62
Achari	6.77
Parayar	5.69
Potmaker	4.92
Chakkiliyar & Unspecified Scheduled Castes	4.31
Nadar	2.15
Vannar	1.69
Komati	1.39
Karkatha Vellalar	1.23
Kodikal Vellalar	0.77
Thuluva Vellalar	0.77
Others & Unspecified	3.85
	100.00

Note: Scheduled Castes are underlined.

castes, who form 18 per cent of households in group 4 and are concentrated in the lower sections of the peasantry. Chettiar households are few among the peasantry; Chettiar, Achari and potmaker have 3 households each in group 4 as a whole. Of the top two groups with the peasantry, 4(1) and (4(2), Maravar households constitute 69.05 per cent and Kallar households 21.43 per cent; of the poorer three classes within the peasantry -- 4(4), 4(5) and 4(6) -- Maravar households constitute one third of households in the group, Kallar households 29.63 per cent and all scheduled castes 31.48 per cent.

Agricultural labour is the great leveller among castes in the village; no other occupation is spread out over as many castes as class 5, in which all but two relatively small caste-groups -- Vannar and Komati -- are represented. In class 5 as a whole, Maravars are the largest single caste, constituting 26.10 per cent of households in the class; all scheduled castes together constitute 39.00 per cent and the largest section of them, the Pallar households, constitute 24.52 per cent of all households in the class. Among the households in class 5 that are completely landless, scheduled castes as a whole are the largest groups, constituting 42.79 per cent of households in the class; of these, the Pallar caste households in the class alone constitute 26.85 per cent of households in the class. Maravar landless agricultural labourers constitute 25.68 per cent of households in the class and Kallar and Chettiar households 9.34 per cent and 6.61 per cent respectively of the households in the group. In class 6, nonagricultural labourers, the scheduled castes together are the largest section, comprising 34.48 per cent of households in the group.

In class 7, households whose main income is from business activity other than agriculture, the largest caste-group is, as may be expected, from the Chettiar caste, who comprise 31.25 per cent of all households in group 7 as a whole.

Class 7 also draws on two relatively small trading communities in the village, the Nadar and Komati castes. A feature of class 7 is that a fairly large number of castes are represented in it, although each in relatively small numbers.

Class 8, as has been indicated earlier, draws only on Achari, potmaker, Vannar and Chakkiliyar castes and on other scheduled caste households.

Taking the table column by column, caste-wise, the Maravars, by popular account the first settlers in the village, are the most numerous: the weight of their numbers also accounts for their being significantly represented in every class except class 8. The caste group as a whole have traditionally held a greater share of the land than any other caste group, a position that it has been steadily losing, particularly in respect of nanjai, in the 1960s and 1970s to other castes: to Udayar landlords from Rayappanpatti, Rowthers from Uthamapalayam and, from among the castes resident in the village, to Chettiar households.

There are 4 Maravar households among the big landlords; Maravars also have a large number of medium landlords and (predictably) households in group 3 from among their number than any other caste. Group 4 as a whole encompasses 16 per cent of the households in the village and 24.47 per cent of Maravar households; there are 23 households, or 12.23 per cent of all Maravar households in the top two classes of the peasantry and 23 households in the middle and lower sections of the peasantry.

Of all Maravar households, 47.89 per cent are manual labourers (classes 5 & 6). The largest group of Maravar households -- 44.16 per cent of them -- are agricultural labourers; of these 83 households, 66 (35.11 per cent of all Maravar households) are landless.

There are no landlords among Kallar households; a relatively high proportion (34.21 per cent of all Kallar households, the largest proportion of any single caste) are spread across group 4. Of these, a significant number -- 9 households -- are in class 4(1) and 4(2), while the majority are in the middle and lower sections of the peasantry.

Among Kallar households also, the largest single group are agricultural labourers, 44.73 per cent of all households in the caste; of all Kallar agricultural labourer households, 70.59 per cent (31.57 per cent of all households in the caste) are landless. We also note that there are 5 Kallar households whose major earnings are from salaried persons, mainly school teachers.

Of all households in the village, 1.69 per cent belong to the major landlord class; major landlords from the Chettiar caste constitute 10.14 per cent of all households in the caste. Only 3 Chettiar households (4.35 per cent of households in the caste) derive their main livelihood from crop cultivation in which they participate with their own manual labour and are represented in group 4. One third of all Chettiar households are agricultural labourers, of these 23 households, 17 (24.63 per cent of all Chettiar households) are landless. A significant feature of the occupational distribution of Chettiar households is that among the major castes, the Chettiars have the largest proportion of their constituent households represented in group 7 -- households whose main income is from business activity other than agriculture.

The working scheduled caste population of the village is, to an overwhelming extent, an agricultural labourer population. There are 164 scheduled caste households, constituting more than a quarter (25.23 per cent) of all household in the village; of these 124 households, or 75.61 per cent, are agricultural labourer households. Of the agricultural

labourer households (88.71 per cent of scheduled caste agricultural labourer households and 67.07 per cent of all scheduled caste households) are landless. Nonagricultural workers comprise another 6.10 per cent of scheduled caste households, bringing the total in the two manual labour classes 5 and 6 to 81.71 per cent of all scheduled caste households. Only 2 scheduled caste households (1.22 per cent of all scheduled caste households) are in classes 4(1) and 4(2); 17 (10.36 per cent of all scheduled caste households) are in classes 4(4), 4(5) and 4(6), the hard-labouring section of the peasantry.

Pallar households are the most numerous among the scheduled castes; they are also the caste with the second highest number of households in the village, after the Maravar caste. Among the Pallar households, 78 households (78.79 per cent of the total) are agricultural labourers, of which 69 (69.70 per cent of all Pallar households) are landless; in the popular perception, of the agricultural workers in the village, Pallar workers are the paddy land workers (in particular, at weeding, transplanting, harvesting and threshing) *par excellence*.

Of Pallar households among the peasantry, one household is in class 4(1) and 15 (15.15 per cent of Pallar households) among the lower categories 4(4), 4(5) and 4(6), which is also the highest proportion for any scheduled caste.

Parayar households are also predominantly agricultural labourers and of them the major section are landless. Only two households are among the peasantry, one in 4(2) and another in 4(6). The Parayars have a higher proportion of plantation workers from among them than any other caste; this is particularly reflected in the fact that 13.51 per cent of Parayar households are in class 6, nonagricultural workers.

Chakkiliyar households are the fewest in number among the scheduled castes and represent their most depressed section. Here again, their main concentration is among agricultural labourers; there is only one peasant household, a sharecropper in 4(5). There are also 4 households from the scheduled castes in group 8.

The Achari households are losing their position as cultivators of the land; the largest segment of the caste -- 43.18 per cent -- are agricultural labourers. While for many families, traditional artisan activity is a dwindling source of remuneration, 31.82 per cent of Achari households still derive their main income from woodwork and blacksmith-work. The potter's trade has fallen on even harder times and only 3 households from this caste derive their main income from potmaking; the major section of households in this caste also are agricultural labourers. The members of the Vannar caste are concentrated in class 8 and work at their traditional task of washing clothes.

The other castes in the wide range of castes that are represented in the village together constitute 8.77 per cent of households; their individual and relative class/occupational positions are clear from the table.

To sum up : The <u>Maravar</u> caste is numerically preponderant in the village. The richest section among Maravar households are among the landlords, a significant section of them is spread out among the peasantry, and another significant section among agricultural labourers. The richest among the <u>Chettiar</u> households are major landlords; the largest section among them gains its major income from business activity other than agriculture; and a significant section are agricultural labourers. There are very few Chettiar households among the peasantry. There are no landlords from among <u>Kallar</u> households; the proportion of peasants to all households in the caste is higher than for other castes; a significant proportion

are agricultural labourers. Scheduled caste households are preponderantly manual labourers (and among them, agricultural labourers); a small section comes within the peasantry. The artisan castes are concentrated in their traditional occupations and in the class of agricultural labourers; a smaller section is among the peasantry.

V Landholdings in the Village

(i) By size categories of ownership and operational holdings:

Table 17 and Table 18 are the two major Tables dealing with the distribution of land by size categories of ownership and operational holdings (see appendix of tables).

Our major conclusions from the tables are the following:

The first is that the clear majority of households are landless. In the tables, the landless have been divided into three subgroups: IA in the table on ownership holdings consists of households that have no ownership holdings, but have household operational holdings -- these are, as a matter of fact, small and medium holdings. Size category 1A in the table on operational holdings consists of households that have no household operational holdings, but have (small or medium) ownership holdings. In both tables, 1B consists of households that have neither ownership nor operational holdings and have some manual labour at agricultural tasks in the household labour schedule over the reference year, and 1C of households that neither own nor operate land and that have no manual labour at agricultural tasks over the reference year. (There is a large area of coincidence between size category 1B and class 5(2), agricultural labourers who neither own nor operate land: of the 267 households that belong to category 1B, 257 households are in class 5(2)).

Together, the landless -- those who have no control over this basic asset -- constitute 69.36 per cent of households in respect of ownership holdings and 65.63 per cent of households in respect of operational holdings.

A second conclusion relates to the other end of the scale, to the fact of concentration of land holdings among the relatively few households in the top size categories. Households in the top three size categories of ownership holdings (the average size of holding in these categories being 10.99 acres, 15.43 acres and 31.14 acres) constitute 2.49 per cent of all households in the village; together these 16 households own 37.91 per cent of the area under all ownership holdings. Households in the top 3 size categories of operational holdings (cultivating, in each size category, an average of 11.67 acres, 15.35 acres and 30.80 acres per household) constitute 2.64 per cent of all households; together the 17 households in this group operate 36.45 per cent of the area covered by all operational holdings.

The other measure of concentration of holdings that we have used, the gini concentration coefficients for the distribution of ownership and operational holdings, reflect these two tendencies -- of landlessness at one end and concentration at the other -- strongly. For all households, the gini ratio for the distribution of ownership holdings is 0.8562 and for operational holdings 0.8343. The gini ratios for the distribution of holdings excluding the landless -- that is, for owner and operator households alone -- are correspondingly lower, although still considerable -- 0.5305 for ownership holdings and 0.5178 for operational holdings.

A third significant feature of the tabulated data is the persistence of a large sector of small and medium holdings, continuing amidst landlessness on the one hand and concentration of land among a few households on the other, and indicating strongly a certain tenacity (however economically

unviable) of small production in the countryside. Of the households that actually own land, 77.66 per cent, belonging to size categories 2 through 5 (they comprise 33.80 per cent of all households) own 38.26 per cent of the area of all holdings; these holdings are, on the average, 1.97 acres each. Of the households that actually operate land, 79.19 per cent (belonging to the same size categories and comprising 27.22 per cent of all households in the village) cultivate 41.16 per cent of the area of all operational holdings; these holdings average 1.99 acres each.

A <u>fourth</u> feature of the tables relates to tenurial patterns. It is to be noted that the bulk of land -- 82.97 of the owned land and 77.25 per cent of the operated land -- is under 'direct' cultivation, that is, owned and cultivated with family and/or hired labour. In the case of the holdings of households in the two highest size categories (all except one of which also belong to the class of major landlords), only 1.01 per cent of their holdings are leased out; 98.91 per cent of their land is cultivated directly by hired, overwhelmingly wage, labour.

Turning to the incidence of tenancy, the standard indicator of tenancy is area leased in as a per cent of total operational holdings. The degree of tenancy in the village, then, is 17.40 per cent; and tenants are overwhelmingly tenants-at-will, working unregistered leases. Thus while direct cultivation has clearly emerged as the leading factor in land operation, tenants-at-will cultivating leased-in land continue to occupy a significant secondary place in the tenurial pattern of the village.

Land mortgaged in constitutes 5.35 per cent of the area of all operational holdings. While this area is not under the ownership of the household, it is not on lease, and is cultivated directly with family and/or hired labour.

/A feature of the tables is that the total extent under opérational holdings is higher than the total extent under ownership holdings. Our discussion of the survey village makes clear the reason for the absence of correspondence between these figures, in particular, the figures relating to land leased out (in Table 17) and land leased in (in Table 18). Land leased out need not necessarily be to households resident in the village and land leased in need not be (and in the present case are decisively not) leased in only from households resident in the village. Another feature of the tables is that the distribution of land holdings measured in percentage shares and in gini ratios, is more concentrated in the upper size classes in the case of ownership holdings than operational holdings. While strictly speaking, the tables do not deal with precisely the same extent of land, a reason for the difference in concentration is the prevalence of small and medium tenant cultivators among the operator-households./7

From a comparison of the two tables, it is clear that land is leased in mainly from households resident outside the village. And the answer to the question "who in the village leases in land?" is, clearly: in terms of size categories of operational holdings, it is the households with medium and small operational holdings that lease in the bulk of land on lease in the village. Of the total extent of land leased in (see Table 18), 77.84 per cent is leased in by households in size categories 2-5. The percentage of land leased in to total operated area is higher in each of these groups than the average for the village as a whole; in the aggregate, 22.54 per cent of the operational holdings in these 4 size-categories are leased in.

We shall now disaggregate the picture, looking separately at nanjai, punjai and thottam ownership and operational holdings. In these tables, we deal only with those households that actually have ownership and operational holdings in the particular irrigation-category (see Tables 19 and 20 in appendix of tables).

Nanjai, as has been noted, is the prime crop land in the village, richly suited to the cultivation of paddy, and on the better plots producing very high yields. A combination of factors has pushed the price of nanjai land,[1/] whose extent is limited by the ayacut of the Periyar system, to extraordinarily high levels -- an acre of nanjai costs from 45000 rupees to 60000 rupees. Table 19 and 20 show the features that have been noted for the previous tables (17 and 18) in particularly accentuated form.

In the top two size classes in both tables, there are 4 households; they constitute 0.62 per cent of all households in the village and 5.26 per cent of all nanjai owner households and 3.92 per cent of all nanjai operator households. Together they own 37 per cent of the area of all nanjai ownership holdings and 31.77 per cent of the area of all nanjai operational holdings. The gini ratios for the

------

1/ These factors include the high concentration (in a relatively small region) of wealth in the hands of a small section -- gained from new profits in nanjai and thottam cultivation; from inflated paddy prices in the first half of the decade, particularly when the smuggling of rice across the border was rife and very lucrative; from thope produce; from cardamom plantations, where prices rose and profits soared in the mid-seventies (this increase was partially associated with the drop in cardomom output from Guatemala after the earthquake of 1975); from usury and business activities outside agriculture -- and the investment of part of this wealth in the (highly competitive) purchase of a resource that is essentially a limited one, land in the Periyar tract. The price of nanjai is not entirely a transitory one -- prices of the better tracts have levelled off at the present range of prices since about 1974, and a number of transactions in nanjai occurred at these price levels in the second half of the seventies. (This also has implications for our discussion of asset values further down: asset values of crop land -- which are, in any case, presented in the tables as a separate category of assets -- are considerably enhanced by the present value of nanjai.)

distribution of nanjai landholdings among households -- it must be remembered that these exclude the landless -- are high, 0.6521 for the distribution of ownership holdings and 0.5934 for operational holdings.

As a proportion of the number of owner and operator households, small and medium cultivators predominate. Of all nanjai owner-households, 86.84 per cent are in the lowest 4 groups (less than 2 hectares): together they own 36.82 per cent of the total area of nanjai ownership holdings, holdings that are, on the average, only 0.98 acres each. Among operator households, households in these groups constitute a full 91.18 per cent of all nanjai operator households: together they operate 49.68 per cent of the area of all nanjai operational holdings, on holdings that average 1.01 acres each.

Tenancy is higher on nanjai than the village average for all types of land combined: 21.84 per cent of the total area of operational holdings are held on lease, mainly from landowners outside the village. The major form of tenancy on nanjai land, where returns are more regular (although not necessarily higher) than on other types of land, is fixed rent (kuthagai). The rent generally works out to about 40 per cent of the produce -- owners do not contribute to input costs -- and in a bad year, the fixed rent in share terms may climb to over 50 per cent of the crop. (The statutorily established rate is 25 per cent for the landowner and 75 per cent for the tenant.) There are still some -- in the survey, about 2 or 3 -- tenant households that are subjected to other forms of rack-renting: after paying the fixed rent, they pay to the landlord a half share of the remaining produce (although in such cases, the landlord generally participates in meeting input costs).

All the tenants on nanjai are relatively small or medium holders; 100 per cent lie in categories 2-5, the largest share -- 77.99 per cent of the land leased in -- being worked by households in categories 3 and 4.

The distribution of nanjai land presents a picture of concentration of this highly valued asset on the one hand, and a large number of small holdings, with a relatively high degree of tenancy, on the other.

Tables 21 and 22 (see appendix of tables) deal with the distribution of punjai ownership and operational holdings among households.

Punjai land, as we have seen, is the least fertile. In general, punjai has a dual character : as agricultural land it represents the traditional sector of agriculture, where backward methods of cultivation on small scale holdings are used in growing crops of a traditional crop-mix that are generally low-yielding. Of the different (irrigation-) types of land, punjai agriculture represents the least intensive scale of cultivation, and while for purposes of uniformity we have used the same size categories for punjai as for other types of land, a difference in holding-size of even two or three acres most often makes a less than corresponding difference to the total production and income from the land, particularly in years when the rain fails.

On the other hand, subject to the features of the agricultural terrain, location of the plot and the level of the water table, punjai land is also potential thottam (this is one of the reasons for divergences in the price of individual plots of punjai). Much of the thottam is recently converted punjai -- richer owners attempt to acquire, through purchase and mortgage and foreclosure, individual or contiguous plots of punjai and convert them into thottam. The price of punjai land varies widely; from about Rs.1000 (and sometimes even less) per acre for a very poor plot, located at a distance from the village and road, to about Rs.5000 for a more fertile, better located plot. When the punjai is located next to a thottam plot, and is readily convertible into thottam, its value rises -- there have been cases where the price of punjai has risen sharply because of such factors, to Rs.15000 per acre.

The pattern of distribution of punjai in the tables reflects the fact that punjai is the traditional sector of cultivation. In the larger size categories, the number of households is still small -- 4 households each in respect of ownership and operational holdings -- and constitute 2.52 per cent of all households operating punjai. The extent of land controlled by the top two size groups is, however, less than for any other type of land -- 13.34 per cent of ownership holdings and 13.39 per cent of operational holdings. The pattern of punjai distribution shows a significant sector of small production, reflected in the existence of a sizeable group in the middle categories of ownership and operational holdings, and the gini ratios reflect this fact: the gini ratio for distribution of punjai ownership holdings among punjai owner-households is 0.4072 and for punjai operational holdings, 0.3973.

Tenancy, which is again confined to the small and medium categories, from 2-5, is lower on punjai than on nanjai and thottam, the degree of tenancy (from table 22) being 12.21 per cent. Tenancy on punjai is on a sharecropping basis (varam), tenant and landowner each taking a half-share of the physical produce of the land. The two years preceding the survey were years of poor rainfall in the eastern punjai tracts and the returns from spending a season in cultivating this single-cropped land most unrewarding -- there are many cases of a tenant getting a bag and even less than a bag of cereal as his share from the harvest.

The distribution of thottam ownership and operational holdings between thottam owner and operator households is given in Tables 23 and 24 (see appendix of tables).

Thottam values also vary widely: from about Rs.15000 for a poor plot with an undependable, and perhaps even dry, well, to about Rs.45000, where the quality of the land and the well is high. In Gokilapuram, one kuzhi (0.60 acres) of high quality thottam was bought by a major landlord household in 1978 for Rs.32000 (Rs.53,333 per acre).

The pattern of distribution of thottam presents an interesting study in relation to the other two irrigation-types (although here we must reintroduce the qualification that the survey does not present us with data for a typically thottam-dominated village). The larger landholdings are relatively more compact, the average size of ownership holding in the top two size groups being 7.22 acres and 10.00 acres and of operational holdings 7.01 acres and 10.00 acres, in contrast, for instance, to the size of holdings of nanjai. The number of households in the top size groups are also relatively more than for other types -- 8 households in the top two groups in respect of ownership and operational holdings, constituting 12.70 per cent of all thottam-owning households and 10.00 per cent of all thottam operating households. The extent of land controlled by these households is also high : they own 40.68 per cent of the area of all thottam ownership holdings and operate 31.23 per cent of the area of all thottam operational holdings.

At the other end, households belonging to the lowest two size categories, constituting 34.92 per cent of all thottam owner households and owning plots that are, on the average, 0.88 acres each, together own only 13 per cent of the total area of thottam ownership holdings. Households belonging to the same size groups constitute 27.50 per cent of all thottam operator households, cultivate plots that are on the average, 0.91 acres, and together operate a more 10.55 per cent of the area of all thottam operational holdings.

Existing between the two extremes of inequality is a sizeable middle, consisting of small and medium holdings. In respect of ownership holdings, households in size categories 3 and 4 comprise 65.08 per cent of all thottam owner households: their holdings are, on the average, 2.09 acres each, and together they own 46.32 per cent of the total area under thottam ownership holdings. In respect of operational

holdings, households in size categories 3 and 4 constitute 65.08 per cent of all thottam operator households, operating 58.22 per cent of the area of all thottam operational holdings, their holdings averaging 2.20 acres each. This middle section pulls the gini ratios down: these are 0.4092 for the distribution of ownership holdings among owner households and 0.3569 for operational holdings. (While the degree of inequality is greater on thottam than a punjai, in the sense that the few households in the top size categories of thottam ownerships and operational holdings control a much higher share of the total area of thottam than the share of punjai controlled by households in the top size categories of punjai ownership and operational holdings, the particular spread of landholdings among households belonging to the small and medium size categories is such that the gini ratios for the distribution of punjai holdings among households and for the distribution of thottam holdings among households are roughly similar.)

We have referred to the limitations of the size of holdings as an index of the scale and type of cultivation in a modernising sector of agricultural production. This limitation of the physical extent of landholding as a measure of the economic size of the unit is likely to be the most marked in the case of thottam, where a more finely-balanced combination of indicators -- for instance, the investment per unit of land (including the costs of land improvement and digging/improving a well and fitting an electric pumpset), the particular crop-pattern selected, costs of cultivation per unit of land and the methods of cultivation, the rate of water utilisation, gross and net profits per acre, and particular features of the socioeconomic status of thottam cultivators -- are likely to provide a more accurate assessment of inequality in thottam cultivation than the pattern of land distribution *per se*.

While thottam is a commercialising sector, it still has -- for reasons which must be more carefully studied -- the highest degree of tenancy among the different types of land: 25.16 per cent or over a quarter of the total area of thottam operational holdings is on lease. Here again, the major proportion of tenants are small and medium cultivators; of the total area under lease, 93.69 per cent is leased in by households in size categories 2 to 5. The main form of tenancy in the thottam tracts of the village is share-cropping, where the tenant and landowner each receive a half-share of the value of the produce. Simple crop sharing on thottam is being replaced by a share system in which the landowner makes an advance to the tenant, and in some cases, shares in the costs of cultivation, particularly where the crop selected requires investment for which the limited resources of the tenant are inadequate.

The preceding tables and discussion provide information for Gokilapuram only at a point of time -- they provide something of a still from a moving picture of changing patterns of land control and (less adequately) of changes in the economic sizes of units of land holding. The period from the 1960s through the 1970s was, by all accounts, a period of considerable activity in the land market in the Valley. While any assessment of the land market and of, for instance, the determinants of land values in the Valley requires detailed and specific study and is far beyond the scope of this paper, it does appear that the inflation of the period, combined with the fact of the high incomes of a small section of the population and the production conditions facing the poorer sections of landholders played a role in redistributing land in favour of the rich. Faced with an erosion of household income, from the land and from wage earnings, and with the price of land -- particularly nanjai -- considerably higher than the cumulative returns that they could expect from the land over a reasonable time-period, it appears that many

belonging to the poorer sections of the peasantry sold their land to richer persons who had the readily investible funds with which to purchase land. The continued eviction of tenant-cultivators also contributed to changes in the distribution of land holdings over the period.

World Agricultural Census Data : (1970-71)

Table 25 is recomputed from Table 1 from the village returns for Gokilapuram at the WAC (see appendix of tables).

Data in the WAC relate only to the revenue precincts of Gokilapuram, that is to an essentially nanjai-dominated village. The data were recomputed by the Karnam from village revenue records; the instructions to Karnams state that where the operational holding of a single household was registered under different names, they were to be entered in the WAC schedules as operated by a single household; that is, defacto and not merely de jure household operational holdings were to be entered in the schedules. It is to be noted that in Gokilapuram revenue village, the largest nanjai holders are resident outside the village. The largest single landholder is still the family of PT Rajan, big Mudaliar landlord and former Justice Party Minister, which owns land in many villages along the Periyar tract, and whose traditional family seat is at Uthamapalayam. These are households that have not been covered by our survey.

As they stand, the data from the WAC returns strikingly confirm some of our conclusions. At one end of the scale, 6 holdings, constituting 1.74 per cent of all operational holdings, cover 23.59 per cent of total operated area; these holdings are of an average size of 37.17 acres per operational holding. At the other end, considering holdings in the lowest two size categories, 74.78 per cent of the number of holdings, or a little under three quarters of all holdings, cover 25.68 per cent, or a fraction more than a quarter, of operated area.

These holdings are of an average size of 0.94 acres each. The gini ratios for the distribution of operated area among holdings is 0.6188. (By way of comparison, the gini coefficient for concentration of the area all operational holdings among size categories of operational holdings for Tamil Nadu, from data in the WAC returns for the State, is 0.5643).

The WAC returns on tenancy are, however, of little use: not a scrap of land is recorded as having been held on lease in 1970-71. The instructions to enumerators at the WAC specifically noted that *de facto* tenancy was to be recorded and not merely tenancy that had been officially registered; this instruction certainly appears to have been honoured only in the breach. (A logical consequence of this is that Table 25 is not likely to be wholly representative of operational holdings; some of the area that was only under the ownership holdings of households must have been recorded as having been under operational holdings.)

Land Holdings by Economic Classification of Households:

Tables 26 and 27 (see appendix of tables) deal with the distribution of ownership and operational holdings by our economic classification of households. (The distribution of households among different classes has been discussed in section IV.)

A first look at the data in the table shows :

--- a concentration of landed property in the hands of the landlords, particularly the major landlords (whose households comprise 1.69 per cent of all households in the village), who own and cultivate the largest holdings in the village;

--- ownership and cultivation of small units by the major section of the peasantry, particularly its lower and

middle sections[1] and by the small section of agricultural labourers that holds land;

--- a vast section that is landless: here the class composition of the landless is more clearly identified and it can be seen that the predominant section among them are landless agricultural labourers;

--- that while direct cultivation predominates, leasing in is a significant secondary feature of tenurial pattern; and that there is a concentration of the incidence of tenancy among the working peasantry, particularly its middle and lower sections, but also (particularly on nanjai) its upper sections and among agricultural labourers (particularly on punjai).

We now take the tables in greater detail.

Major landlords who constitute 1.69 per cent of all households hold 29.42 per cent of the total area of ownership holdings and 27.14 per cent of the area of operational holdings in the village. Their holdings consist of a relatively larger share of the better land in the village -- 45.41 per cent of their total ownership holdings are nanjai ownership holdings, 33.38 per cent punjai and 21.21 per cent thottam; in respect of operational holdings the proportions are 46.55 per cent nanjai, 33.66 per cent punjai and 19.79 per cent thottam (Table 29). (Village averages are also given in Section I, Table 11). The average size of holding per major landlord household is far and away the highest in the village --- 21.08 acres in respect of ownership holdings and 20.90 in respect of operational holdings (Table 28). Of the major landlords' total holdings, 98.20 per cent of the area under ownership holdings and 99.02 per cent of the area

----

1/ References to the upper sections of the peasantry are to classes 4(1) and 4(2); to the middle section, to class 4(3); and to the lower section, to classes 4(4), 4(5) and 4(6).

under operational holdings are under 'direct' cultivation; they are mainly capitalist landlords, cultivating their land with hired -- overwhelmingly wage -- labour.

Medium landlords and landowners in category 3 hold a much smaller proportion of the total landholdings -- medium landlords control 8.99 per cent of the total area under ownership holdings and 8.98 per cent of the total area under operational holdings; and households in category (3) 5.09 per cent of the area of all ownership holdings and 3.83 per cent of the area of all operational holdings. A feature of the holdings of both these classes is that of the total holdings that they have, the punjai component is (for both classes and for ownership and operational holdings), less than the average for the village as a whole. While the bulk of their land is under 'direct' cultivation, the proportion of area leased out to total ownership holdings is higher than for major landlords (although the extent of land itself is small). The medium landlords and households in category (3) are not big owners in terms of the average size of holding that each household controls: for the medium landlords the average size of ownership holdings is 6.84 acres and of operational holdings 6.24 acres; for nonlabouring small landowners the average size of ownership holding per household is 3.65 acres, and of operational holdings, 2.95 acres.

Among the peasantry, households in the topmost class, 4(1), own 14.33 per cent of the area under ownership holdings and 15.28 per cent of the area under operational holdings -- the highest proportion for any class after the major landlords. The two upper categories together own 20.26 per cent of the area of owned land and 22.09 per cent of the area of operated land. The middle and lower sections of the peasantry, 4(3) to 4(6), together have very limited control over land ownership -- they account for only 8.88 per cent of the total area under ownership holdings. Owing to the high incidence of tenancy

among these sections, their share of the area of all operational holdings is higher -- 17.03 per cent. In terms of the spread of holdings over different types of land, in all classes except 4(2), the bulk of peasant ownership holdings in each class is constituted by punjai ownership holdings. (Class 4(2) is an exception, with a low proportion of nanjai and a relatively high proportion of thottam.) Because of the incidence of tenancy among the peasantry, the nanjai and thottam components of operational holdings are higher than of ownership holdings -- the detail is in Table 29.

The peasantry, in general, cultivate small holdings. There are, however, differences between peasant classes, households in the highest group, 4(1), having average holdings that are considerably larger than the holdings of other classes of the peasantry. It is to be noted that while, as a class 4(1) owns and operates a proportion of total area that is next in aggregate to the major landlords, the average size of holding (in the case of both ownership and operational holdings) is much smaller than that of the major landlords, in each case being about one-fourth of the average holding of a major landlord household. The households in the middle and lower sections have considerably smaller average holdings -- ownership holdings range between 1.33 acres per household and 2.75 acres in classes 4(3) to 4(6) and operational holdings from 1.90 acres to 3.30 acres (the average size of operational holdings being higher than ownership for all classes among the peasantry because of the incidence of tenancy among them.)

Agricultural labourers together own 12.36 per cent of the area of all ownership holdings and 12.69 per cent of the area of all operational holdings. Almost all of this land is punjai -- 92.62 per cent of the ownership holdings of 5(1)a and 5(1)c together is punjai and 95.80 per cent of the operational holdings of 5(1) a and 5(1)b together is punjai. Among agricultural labourers, although average

holdings per landholding household are 2.27 acres for ownership holdings and 2.28 acres for operational holdings, consisting as they do mainly of punjai land, they represent very small units in terms of productivity and economic weight.

Tenancy, as can be seen from Table 27, is concentrated among the peasantry. The middle and lower sections lease in 48.79 per cent of the area of all land that is leased in; the two upper sections lease in 26.46 per cent of all land that is leased in. Among agricultural labourers, those who operate but do not own land who constitute class 5(1)b, lease in 17.97 per cent of the area of all land leased in. This land is, however, mainly punjai -- more than 99 per cent of all land leased in by this class is punjai.

Data on leasing out must be considered with the qualification that leasing out is not as useful or reliable an indicator of tenancy as is area leased in; the area leased out is also considerably less in the survey than area leased in, and the area leased out as a per cent of ownership holdings considerably less than the area leased in as a per cent of operational holdings. In the case of leasing out, major landlords lease out 4.56 per cent of all the land leased out, medium and small landlords together lease out 12.48 per cent of all land leased out, classes 4(1) to 4(6) lease out 20.76 per cent of all land leased out and agricultural labourers, 24.15 per cent. The relatively high percentage of leasing out by peasants and agricultural labourers is explained by the fact that the bulk of the land that they lease out is comprised of small plots of punjai, and the lessors are, in general, groups of working people who, rather than divert labour time to the cultivation of undeveloped and unremunerative holdings, lease them out. Of all land leased out by classes from 4(1) to 4(6), 68.68 per cent is punjai; of all land leased out by agricultural labourers, 83.85 per cent is punjai. Of land leased out by all households, 67.24 per cent, or more than two-thirds, is punjai.

We now take the table by separate irrigation type.

It is on *nanjai* that the high concentration of land holdings in the hands of the major landlords is most marked: they own 60.17 per cent of the area of all nanjai ownership holdings and 52.94 per cent of the area of all nanjai operational holdings. These holdings are mainly under their direct cultivation. The average size of holding per household is far higher among major landlords than for other classes of nanjai-owning and nanjai-operating households -- 10.53 acres per household in respect of ownership holdings and 9.73 acres per household in respect of operational holdings.

It is a striking feature of the tables that every class outside the major landlords has an average holding of *less than 1.50 acres per household*.

Medium landlords control 7.26 per cent of the area of all nanjai ownership holdings and 5.16 per cent of the area of operational holdings, bringing the total controlled by major and medium landlords (together constituting 3.23 per cent of households in the village) to 67.43 per cent of the area of nanjai ownership holdings and 58.10 per cent of the area of operational holdings.

It is also of note that households in categories (2) (3) lease out and mortgage out a relatively larger share of their holdings than the major landlords.

Among the peasantry, the top group, 4(1) owns 10.63 per cent of the total area of owned land and operates 15.94 per cent of the total area of operated land; these shares representing the largest shares for a class after the major landlords (although the average size of individual ownership and operational holdings is considerably smaller: in the case of class 4(1), the average area of ownership holding per household is 1.24 acres and of operational holding, 1.46 acres). All the other groups within the peasantry, from 4(2) to 4(6), together own only 3.04 per cent of the

area of all nanjai ownership holdings, and all agricultural labourers together own a mere 0.47 per cent of the area of all nanjai ownership holdings. Inequality in the distribution of land holdings is, of course, higher in respect of nanjai ownership than of nanjai operational holdings; tenancy among the peasantry ensures this. Households in classes 4(2) to 4(6) operate 13.02 per cent of the total area of nanjai operational holdings, and agricultural labourers, 0.31 per cent.

Tenancy is concentrated among the middle and lower sections of the peasantry taken together; groups 4(3) to 4(6) together lease in 37.91 per cent of all leased-in nanjai land. A noteworthy feature of the data, however, is that the individual class with the highest proportion of nanjai land leased in is 4(1), the top group of the peasantry -- indicating that some landlords prefer to lease out their land to households that have the wherewithal to meet the costs of seed, fertiliser and pesticides and generally have a sturdy pair of plough animals.

In the case of <u>punjai</u> agriculture, where systems of cultivation are more backward, major landlords (who still have the largest single share of any class of punjai) own 16.67 per cent of the total area of punjai ownership holdings and 16.98 per cent of the area of punjai operational holdings. They also hold the largest holdings per household, 8.60 acres both in respect of ownerships and of operational holdings.

The top section of the peasantry, in 4(1), own and operate, as a class, the next highest share of punjai -- 16.76 per cent of the total area under punjai ownership holdings and 17.50 per cent of the area under operational holdings; the average size of landholding per household in this class is considerably less than the average holding of major landlords (see Table 28). All other sections of

the peasantry hold a relatively larger share of punjai than they do of nanjai; classes 4(2) to 4(6) together own 17.23 per cent of the area of all punjai ownership holdings and 19.77 per cent of the area of all operational holdings.

Agricultural labourers working small plots of land (average punjai ownership holding per household in 5(1)a and 5(1)c together is 2.18 acres and average punjai operational holding per household in 5(1)a and 5(1)b together is 2.16 acres) hold, as a class, a far larger share of this least productive type of land than they do of nanjai and thottam; households in 5(1) and 5(1)c together own 19.95 per cent of the total area of punjai ownership holdings and households in 5(1)a and 5(1)b together operate 22.01 per cent of the area under all operational holdings. This fact is evidence enough of the failure of punjai cultivation on small plots to provide subsistence; despite their share in punjai, the main activity of households in 5(1) through 5(c) is manual labour outside the punjai holdings that they have.

Tenancy on punjai, in general lower than on nanjai and thottam, is spread across the peasantry (see table 27); the largest share of punjai land on lease is, however, among agricultural labourers, among whom households in 5(1)b alone lease in 47.26 per cent of all punjai that is leased in.1/

Some of the specific features of the distribution of thottam land among households and the limitations of the extent of land holdings as an indicator of the scale of cultivation on thottam have been discussed in an earlier

----

1/ We thus have the phenomenon of one section of agricultural labourers, 5(1)c leasing out, as a class, the highest share of punjai leased out (24.24 per cent) and another section, 5(1)b operating, as a class, the highest single share of punjai land leased in.

section. The distribution of thottam among households of different classes also has specific features.

The major landlords concentrate in their hands a high proportion of the total extent of thottam -- they own 33.04 per cent of all thottam owned and 24.06 per cent of the total area of operational holdings. (Major and medium landlord households together control 50.44 per cent of the area of all ownership holdings and 36.70 per cent of the area of all operational holdings on thottam.) The average size of holding per major landlord household is also considerably higher for households in this class than in any other class (see Table 28). In the case of thottam, while the extent of land held by landlords is high, the extent owned by the peasantry as a whole as a per cent of the total area of ownership holdings -- 31.93 per cent -- is higher than its corresponding share of nanjai ownership holdings. Owing to a high degree of tenancy and differences in the scale of cultivation, the area operated by the peasantry as a whole as a per cent of the area under all operational holdings is 54.[illegible] per cent, or considerably higher than its corresponding share of nanjai or punjai operational holdings.

Within the peasantry, the distribution is skewed. In the case of ownership holdings, the top two groups among the peasantry own the bulk of thottam held by the peasantry as a whole -- 25.25 per cent of the area of all thottam ownership holdings, compared to 6.68 per cent of the area of all thottam ownership holdings held by owners in the middle and lower groups of the peasantry. (There are corresponding disparities in the average size of ownership holdings per household between these groups). In the case of operational holdings, however, tenancy (which is highest on thottam) alters the picture : the top two groups cultivate 25.06 per cent of all thottam operational holdings, while the share-cropp dominated middle and lower sections of the peasantry, working on smaller individual holdings, together cultivate 29.37 per cent of the area of all operational holdings.

Tenants on thottam are completely located among the peasantry from classes 4(2) through 4(6); for each of the 4 classes from 4(3) to 4(6), the leased in portion of the total operational holdings of the class predominates over the other components.

We shall briefly sum up the data in the tables. Agricultural change has not broken the concentration of landed property in the hands of the landlords; on the contrary, the grip of the major landlords -- who constitute only 1.69 per cent of all households in the village -- on the land remains strong. The major landlords not only have by far the largest share of the land, they also own the largest share of the best tracts in the village; the proportion of nanjai and thottam in their holdings is considerably higher than for the village as a whole. They also have the highest average size of holding per household for every type of land. The overwhelming proportion of the land holdings of the landlords is under direct cultivation, with hired labour.

Each class of the peasantry -- distinguished by definition from the landlords by the fact that they participate in the major manual operations on the land that they operate -- cultivates a much smaller proportion of the land than the landlords, on holdings that are, on the average, a fraction of the size of landlords' holdings. Among the peasant classes, the topmost classes, 4(1) and 4(2) and particularly 4(1) are relatively better endowed with land, although here also the total holdings and holdings per household are far smaller than that of landlords.

The peasantry own relatively inferior land, the proportion of punjai in their total ownership holdings being considerably greater than for the landlords or for the village as a whole.

The vast majority of agricultural labourers neither own nor operate land; for those who do, their holdings are overwhelmingly punjai.

In respect of the distribution of operational holdings, the top sections of the peasantry hold a larger share of the land and operate on the average bigger individual holdings than the middle and lower sections, although these holdings, as hardly need be mentioned, are far smaller than those of the landlords.

Although the bulk of operated land is under direct cultivation, rent-receiving remains significant, tenants being concentrated among different sections of the peasantry, particularly its lower and middle sections, but also including the top sections of the peasantry. In the case of the most unproductive sector of cultivation, punjai, agricultural labourers have the largest single share of leased in land. The prevalence of tenancy among the working peasantry is a factor in making the distribution of ownership holdings across households more concentrated than that of operational holdings.

Nanjai land shows the greatest concentration of ownership in the hands of major landlord households, while among the middle and lower sections of the peasantry each class in the aggregate owns less than a per cent of the total owned area, and all agricultural labourers together less than half a per cent of all owned nanjai. In the case of operational holdings the fact that for most classes of the peasantry access to land is more through tenancy than actual ownership (this is true of nanjai and thottam) diffuses the distribution of operational holdings relative to that of ownership holdings. This 'diffusion', it must be emphasised, is only in relation to the more extreme concentration of ownership holdings; the major landlords, cultivating the biggest holdings, hold a

formidable share of the area of all operated nanjai, cultivated with hired labour. The top section of the peasantry, who as a class hold the highest share of the total operated area among the peasantry, operate a much smaller share of the total area of nanjai than the landlords, on holdings that are, on the average, about one-fourth the size of the average holdings of major landlords. The average size of operational holding per household among the middle and lower sections of the peasantry, who mainly cultivate leased-in land, are small units of less than one acre each.

Punjai, representing the lagging sector of agriculture, shows a different pattern of distribution of land among households. While here again major landlords hold the largest share of the total area under ownership and operational holdings and the largest holdings per household, there is a wider spread of this relatively unproductive and less-valued asset among the classes of the peasantry and agricultural labourers. The degree of tenancy is lowest on punjai; its incidence is highest among the section of agricultural labourers who own no land but lease in small plots of punjai, while still earning their main income from manual labour.

The distribution of thottam among classes presents yet another pattern. On the one hand, the major landlords hold a very high proportion of all land owned and operated. On the other hand, particularly in respect of operational holdings and owing to a high degree of tenancy (mostly leased-in from owners outside the village) all peasant classes hold a considerably larger share of the total area of operational holdingsthan they do on nanjai or punjai. When dealing with the distribution of thottam land among households, we re-enter the qualification that the physical extent of land *per se* is less reliable as a measure of the scale and type of cultivation on thottam than on other types of land and that disparities in the distribution of land in acre terms, while being a useful first approximation, become less adequate a measure of actual inequality between households engaged in thottam cultivation.

Two-way Tables

We have attempted, in Tables 30 to 37* of a series of two way tables, marking on the vertical scale the class to which a household belongs and on the horizontal scale the size category of landholding in which it occurs. We shall briefly discuss two aspects of these tables.

In the first place, there is a coincidence between households in the higher size categories of land holdings and the major landlord households (in respect of ownership and operational holdings) on the one hand, and a general tendency for the holdings of households in lower sections of the peasantry and agricultural labourers to occur in the lower size categories of ownership and operational holdings on the other. This is particularly marked in the case of nanjai holdings (and with that, of nanjai ownership holdings), where the diagram more clearly takes the shape of a wedge, sloping upwards and to the right.

Secondly, it is clear from the diagram that there is no straight, one-to-one correspondence between the size of the landholding of a household and its class status. This is particularly clear in the case of punjai holdings, where the low productivity of land forces persons in even the middle size categories of land holdings to labour out, and consequently makes for a greater incidence of households in the middle portions of the diagram. It is also the case with thottam, where for entirely different reasons than punjai, the scale factor is less adequately captured by the extent of land holdings.

---

*We have not been able to reproduce these tables in the appendix of tables.

VI Asset Holdings in the Village

The grip of the major landlord households (and correspondingly, households in the top size categories of ownership holdings) on the extent of owned land in the village tightens into a stranglehold when we come to their control of the asset holdings of households in the village.

Table 38 (see appendix of tables) records the asset holdings of households in rupees by size class of household ownership holdings. The last column, all assets, is an aggregate of the seven categories of assets in the preceding columns:

-- Crop land records the value of all nanjai, punjai and thottam ownership holdings at the rates mentioned in section V. The entries against 1C (which are landless) refers to small holdings of some of them in distant villages, generally leased or mortgaged out.

-- Other agricultural assets refers, in general, to agricultural implements and to means of production (other than land). This category includes ploughs, animal-driven puddlers, hand sprayers, power sprayers, pumpsets: diesel and electric, carts and tractors and tractor accessories.

-- Draught animals is comprised of animals actually used for ploughing and carting. There is a wide variation in the market value of these animals: from Rs.700 to Rs.900 for a weak and poorly fed pair of an inferior breed to Rs.2500 to Rs.3000 for the hefty, well-matched Kangeyam animals owned by richer landlords.

-- Other livestock includes all milch cattle, poultry, goats, and dhobis' donkeys.

-- Thope land is of two types : regular tamarind, coconut and fruit groves, valued by unit of land, and individual trees, valued at the rate per tree.

-- Plantation land in the case of households in Gokilapuram includes only land located in the eastern Erasakkanayakanur and High Wavy hills and in the south east. There were no households with cardamom and other estate holdings in the western hills in Kerala. The price of plantation land in the eastern hills ranges from Rs.4000 to Rs.5000 per acre.

-- Nonagricultural assets consist of a detailed check list of assets, physical and financial, not covered by previous categories. The list of nonagricultural assets covered in the survey is given at the end of the appendix of tables.

The structure of the schedule that we used and the time that was taken over each interview helped to make it possible for us to net data on assets of households in considerable detail.

The reliability of such detailed data on asset holdings must, of course, be closely assessed. We have noted, in an earlier section, how we attempted to correct cases of obvious concealment and of inconsistency in the schedule data. The remaining sources of error, as far as we can infer, are likely to lie in the following areas.

The data on the actual extent of land holdings (of crop land, thope and plantation land) are, in our assessment, likely to be accurate, particularly in respect of crop land, the data on which were checked with the household and with (among others) the karnam. In valuing land holdings, we used standard value norms for calculating the value of thope and plantation land: these figures were obtained from interviews with a number of well-informed respondents in the village. In the case of crop land, the value per acre of nanjai fell within a fairly well-defined range, and although we could not ensure the accuracy of the precise value per unit of nanjai held by a household, we were able to ensure that the figures in the schedule actually fell within the known village-level

limits. In the case of punjai and thottam, however, the problem was of greater magnitude, since the range of values of punjai and thottam -- being dependent on various conditions of fertility, topography, location and water availability -- are very wide.

The other area of less than accurate data is likely to be in the category of nonagricultural assets. Some items of data in this category cannot be concealed -- a large house, an automobile or motorcycle or even a large piece of nonagricultural land. (Others have little to conceal: in the case of a poor family, living in a one-roomed hut, a large part of household assets were generally apparent to the eye.) There are, however, assets that could not be accurately assessed in an interview or through cross-checking: for instance, the value of gold and jewellery, of financial assets and of items such as furniture and household appurtenances, particularly in a many-roomed residence.

Our attempt in this section is to indicate only the broad trends that emerge from the data on the distribution of assets among households in the village, and it is with the qualifications noted in preceding paragraphs that we introduce the tables on asset holdings.

<u>By size category of ownership holding</u>

Asset holdings in the village, as even a first glance at the table shows, are considerably more concentrated in the hands of households in the top two size categories of ownership holdings, who constitute 1.56 per cent of the total number of households, than the extent of land: these two groups together control 42.20 per cent of all assets in the village. At the other end of the scale, 69.36 per cent of all households, landless households in 1A, 1B and 1C together, own only 8.45 per cent.

The statistics on concentration are figures to conjure with: the average asset holding of <u>each</u> household in the top

size category (who constitute 0.76 per cent of all households) is greater than the assets held by all households in each size category from 1-4. Considering one of these groups alone, the assets that 267 households (comprising 41.52 per cent of all households) in group 1B[1] together is only 48.86 per cent or less than half of the average holding of each household in the top size category.

The concentration coefficient for the distribution of assets among households is 0.7830.[2] By comparison, the Gini coefficient for the concentration of assets among all rural households in Tamil Nadu, classified by size category of asset holdings, from data in the RBI Debt and Investment Survey of 1971-1972, is 0.7148.[3]

We shall consider the distribution of each category of assets separately.

Crop land: We have seen that the proportion of the extent of total ownership holdings of crop land owned by households in the top two size classes is 29.54 per cent. The fact that they own a disproportionately large share of the best land is reflected in the fact that of the total value of owned crop land in the village, households in these two groups own 47.58 per cent. Another indicator of the high concentration of the value of crop land in the hands of households in the top size categories is that once again, the average holdings per household of the 5 households in the top size group (above 10 hectares) is greater than the class aggregate of crop land asset holdings of each size category uptil class 4. The concentration coefficient for this distribution is higher than for all assets: 0.8858.

1/ or households that neither own nor operate land and have some agricultural labouring out in their labour-schedule for the reference year.

2/ We have used the formula for the Gini coefficient in computing this coefficient, which measures the degree of concentration of asset holdings among households that are indexed by the size category of ownership holding of the household.

3/ C.T.Kurien, Dynamics of Rural Transformation

Other agricultural assets: It is in the nature of this category of assets, which consists of agricultural implements and means of production owned by households, that differences between households in the number and type of assets are marked by large and progressively bigger leaps in the value of asset holdings. A large number of households have no such implements at all. A household that has a minimal asset holding in this category owns only a ploughshare and a yoke -- together costing about 35 rupees. At a next stage a household may own an electric pumpset and perhaps a power sprayer or a bullock-driven puddler, the combined value of which is Rs.5600 (electric pumpset : Rs.4500; power sprayer, Rs.950; puddler: Rs.150), a vastly higher amount than the value of asset holdings of the one-plough household. At another level, a few households own tractors (in addition to ploughs, sprayers, carts, pumpsets and other assets), which along with tractor accessories (trailer, cage wheel, tiller and disc plough) costs nearly a lakh of rupees.

The ownership of these assets is more concentrated in the hands of households in the top size categories than any other asset group: households in the top size category alone (0.76 per cent of all households) control 65.83 per cent of all assets in the category. The aggregate asset holdings of all households in each size class from 1 to 8 is less than the average holding of each household in the top size category. The concentration ratio for the distribution is quite staggering: 0.9248.

The extreme concentration in the lands of households in the top size categories* of the most modern implements and (non-land) means of production together with a high concentration of crop land and (as we shall see) of other assets, including plantation and thope land in their hands, is clearly a

----

*from whose number as we have seen, most of the major landlord households are also drawn

phenomenon that carries within it a portent for the future of property relations in the village under the present system: their present position in the ownership and asset structure of land and other assets provides these households with a springboard for further accumulation.

Draught Animals : The distribution of this asset among households has certain noteworthy features. The first is that a large section of households have no draught animals at all; the number of draught animals in the village has, over a long period, been on the decline. A major contributory factor in this process is certainly the loss of land by many households through sale, mortgage and the eviction of many tenants; consequently, a large number of households no longer have household operational holdings on which to use draught animals. There has also been a decline in the use of exchange labour by households, particularly in the ploughing operation. Further, for poorer sections of the peasantry and agricultural labourers, tractorisation has reduced the possibilities of labouring out with animals on the land of others for wages. Tractors have affected the use of draught animals in ploughing (although it is to be noted that even on tractor-ploughed land, draught animals and ploughs are still used for at least one wet-land ploughing and for nursery ploughing), carting and in the second threshing of the paddy crop.

Households in the top two size categories own a considerable proportion of total assets in this category, 20.13 per cent; concentration of ownership in this category, however, is more sharply expressed in terms of the average holding per household in the top two size categories, Rs.2400 and Rs.2800 per household. At the same time, with new methods of cultivation, the importance of ownership of this asset is losing its significance; the total value of draught animals in the hands of households in the top two size categories (as well as in the hands of major landlord households) in absolute terms and in terms of their share of total assets is less than in the case of every other asset (except other livestock). The concentration coefficient for the distribution is correspondingly lower: 0.4703.

<u>Other livestock</u> : The Cumbum Valley is not a region where animal husbandry has achieved importance as a specialised branch of agriculture; there is no specialised rearing, for instance, of draught animals, milch cattle, sheep and goats or poultry.

Inequality in respect of the ownership of this asset is again expressed mainly in terms of the average asset holdings per household in the larger size categories of land holdings, particularly the top size category, in which 5 households have average holdings of Rs.3894 per household -- far higher than the average in any other size category.

The households in the two highest size categories own 16.57 per cent of the value of all assets in this category. This is accompanied by a diffusion of ownership of petty holdings of livestock, spread thinly over a relatively wide section. This is most evident in the case of households in 1B (landless households that labour out at agricultural tasks), among a section of whom loans were advanced by the State Bank of India for the purchase of milch buffalo in the year previous to the reference year.

The concentration coefficient for the distribution of this group of assets reflects the existence of the thin spread: 0.3164.

<u>Thope land</u>: Groves are another asset traditionally held by the landlords of the village. We have noted that this column in our table includes trees grown in groves and individual trees: as can be expected, the tree crop holdings of the richer households are mainly in groves, although they also own individual trees, grown on tank bunds, poramboke, privately held nonagricultural land and by the roadside; the poor mainly own individual trees. The concentration of ownership of crop land in the hands of households in the top size categories is accompanied by a concentration of ownership of

tree wealth in their hands : households in the top two size categories (1.56 per cent of all households) own 47.92 per cent of assets in this category. The concentration ratio for this distribution is 0.8953.

Plantation land is also mainly owned by households in the top size categories; households in the top two size categiries own 46.59 per cent of the value of all assets in this group, and households in the top category (0.78 per cent of all households) own 37.46 per cent of the value of all assets. The concentration coefficient is 0.7206.

Nonagricultural Assets: The composition of these assets shows great variation over households. At one extreme, the very poorest may have hardly any assets at all, living in a rented or mortgaged hut, with only a few worn out earthen utensils that could hardly be valued at all. At the other extreme, the richest households had entries against almost every group of assets, financial and physical, marked on our list of nonagricultural assets. For the landless, whose hold on productive assets is weak, nonagricultural assets -- in general, assets other than means of production -- constitute the largest single category of assets : 76.05 per cent of all assets of households in category 1A, 89.25 per cent of all assets of households in category 1B and 68.69 per cent of the assets of households in category 1C. In the case of this asset-group, the concentration of ownership in the hands of households in the top two size categories (they own 28.97 per cent of all assets in this category) and the high average asset holding per household in these groups is accompanied by a certain diffusion of ownership of assets over households (whose average asset holding, per household is much smaller); the concentration coefficient for the distribution still, however, indicates fairly high concentration, 0.5837.

Asset holdings by economic classification of the population:

Table 39 (see appendix of tables) presents the data for the distribution of assets by economic classification of the population. Many features of this distribution closely parallel the distribution in Table 38; we shall make brief notes on the data in this table.

A readily apparent feature of the Table is that for all assets and every individual asset group, the share of the total value of assets held by the major landlord households, who constitute 1.69 per cent of all households, is considerably higher than the share held by households in the top two size categories.

The major landlords hold 49.54 per cent of all assets. The average asset holding per household is more than 9.3 lakhs of rupees; this figure is higher than the holdings per class of every class other than medium and small landlords and the highest class, 4(1), among the peasantry. The combined assets of 257 households (39.54 per cent of all households) that are landless labourer households are 60.00 per cent of the assets of each major landlord household.

The asset holdings of medium landlord households and households in category 3 are far below those of the major landlords, and their average asset holdings are about one-fifth and one-eighth respectively of the average asset holding of each major landlord household. The average asset holding per household in these two classes is, however, more than a lakh, and is considerably higher than for any other class in the village.

As a class, households in the highest group among the peasantry own 8.34 per cent of all asset holdings in the village: after the 49.54 per cent share of major landlord households, this is the next highest share of a class group.

The average holdings per household, however, are lower than in each of the preceding classes, although well above the average for all households in the village. The households in the other group that falls in the (loosely defined) category of rich peasant, 4(2), own considerably less as a group than all households in 4(1); the average asset holding per household is less than half of that of households in 4(1). The average holding per household of this group is however, higher than the average for all households in the village.

It is an indication of the concentration of ownership of assets among the wealthier households that the average asset holding in respect of every other class whose main income is derived from cultivation or manual labour -- that is, households in 4(3), 4(4), 4(5) and 4(6), constituting the middle and poorer sections of the peasantry, agricultural labourer households in each of the subdivisions of 5, and nonagricultural labourer households in each subdivision of 6 -- is lower than the average for all households in the village.

The contours of inequality are even more sharply defined when we look at the figures for manual labourers: all agricultural labourer households comprise 48.93 per cent of all households; they own 5.33 per cent of the value of all assets. All manual labour households (in classes 5 and 6) constitute 53.39 per cent of all households; they own 5.89 per cent of all assets. The average asset holding per landless agricultural labourer household (class 5(2)) is a mere 6.84 per cent of the average asset holding per household for all households in the village; the average asset holding per landless nonagricultural labourer household is 6.59 per cent of the same figure.

Major landlords own 52.95 per cent of the value of all crop land -- as we have seen, they own 29.42 per cent of the extent of crop land; the fact that nanjai and thottam occupy disproportionately large shares in their holdings pushes up their share of the total asset value of all crop land. Medium landlord households and nonlabouring small landholder households own the next largest average holdings per household, although these holdings are only 19.00 per cent and 12.90 per cent respectively of the asset holding per major landlord household. The top bracket of the peasantry (which owns 11.28 per cent of the asset value of all crop land) holds, as a class, the second highest share of the asset value of all crop land. The average holding per household is, on the one hand, only a fraction (10.00 per cent) of the average for a major landlord household; on the other hand, the average holding per household in both the top brackets of the peasantry (classes 4(1) and 4(2)) are greater than the average for all households in the village. As in the case of the "all assets" category, in every other class among the peasantry and manual labourers the average asset holding per household is less than the village average holding per household. All manual labourers own 2.72 per cent of the crop land assets in the village, consisting, as we have seen mainly of punjai land.

The major feature of the data on the distribution of other agricultural assets is that on the one hand, the major landlords have a near monopoly on the ownership of this asset: households in this class own 71.84 per cent of the value of assets in this group. On the other hand, all other sections have small holdings of this group of assets: many sections have no asset holdings at all of this group of assets.

As a class, the second group of the peasantry, households in 4(2) own the highest share of assets in this category among the peasantry -- 6.62 per cent of the value of assets in this category to the major landlords' 71.84 per cent. The reason for this is that thottam is the predominant component of

ownership holdings in this category (see table 29): this is land with wells fitted with electric pumpsets, which pushes up the total value of asset holdings of households in this class. The average asset holding per household in this class, which is the second highest among all classes, is again only a fraction -- a mere 5.34 per cent -- of the average holdings per household of each major landlord household.

The major landlords own 21.15 per cent of the value of all draught animals in the village -- each household among them possesses a pair of hefty draught animals. We have mentioned in earlier sections the declining importance of draught animals in cultivation and the relative decline (with stress on the relative, since the major landlords still own 21 per cent of the total assets in this group) in the incentive for landlords to maintain large numbers of draught animals and establish in respect of this asset the kind of monopoly of ownership that they have in other assets.

All classes of the peasantry hold a higher share of total value of this asset than of any other; it is to be noted, however, that while bullock power is still a significant factor in peasant cultivation, even sections of the peasantry hire in tractor-time on nanjai and thottam land, and the absolute number and quality of draught animals among these sections are on the decline.

Agricultural labourers as a whole own a larger share of this asset -- 20.77 per cent of the total value of assets in the group -- than of any other asset except other livestock. With the decline of opportunities for labouring out with plough and bullocks, the number of draught animals among this section is also on the decline.

We have mentioned that the Valley is not a region where the breeding of other livestock (or draught animals) is a specialised branch of agriculture. In respect of this asset, the thirteen major landlord households have by far

the highest average holdings per household; together they own 18.72 per cent of the value of all assets in the group. For the rest, small holdings of petty livestock are spread thinly across classes of the peasantry and agricultural labourers. In respect of landless agricultural labourers, although the average holding per household is well below the average for all households in the village, these 257 households as a class own the largest single share of other livestock in the village; as has been noted, some agricultural labourer households bought milch buffalos with loans from the State Bank in the year preceding the survey.

Thope land has been a traditional asset of the landlords, who own the best coconut and tamarind groves in the village. Major landlords have cornered two thirds of the total value of this lucrative source of income -- they own 66.60 per cent of the value of assets in this group. The middle landlord households, who are a far second to the major landlords, retain the second highest share of the value of all thope land; the top section of the peasantry, in terms of the aggregate value of their holdings and average asset holding per household are a far third in this asset group. Asset holdings of the landlords in this category are concentrated in groves, those of the peasantry and agricultural labourers are, in general aggregate values of individual tree holdings.

Major landlords also own the vast bulk -- 60.39 per cent -- of the value of plantation land. The next highest share of a class is held by households in category 7 -- households whose major income is from business activity other than crop cultivation. Asset holdings per household in this category are, as can be expected, only a fraction -- 7.59 per cent -- of the corresponding figure for the major landlord households.

Major landlords own the largest share, 36.28 per cent, of the value of nonagricultural assets; the assets that they hold also cover the widest range of assets listed in our list

of nonagricultural assets. Medium landlords and households in category (3) also have relatively high holdings in this category (although far less than the major landlords) -- these consist mainly of the building and household appurtenances of the traditional landlord houses that they live in. Among the peasantry, households of the two top sections of the peasantry have the highest aggregate holdings (these are well below the holdings of each of the landlord classes) and average holding per household. Every other section of the peasantry and each class of manual labourers has a lower asset holding per household than the average for the village as a whole; all manual labourer households who constitute 53.39 per cent of households in the village, own only 13.31 per cent of the value of all assets in this group. Among manual labourers, this consists mainly of the value of the hut in which they live and of cooking utensils, and perhaps the value of a tin trunk in which clothes and other small possessions are stored. A landless agricultural labourer household, on the average, has an asset holding in this group of assets that is a mere 0.98 per cent of the average holding of a major landlord household.

Briefly considering the table row-wise, crop land remains the predominant asset in the village -- nearly 54 per cent of the value of all assets are in this group. Nonagricultural assets occupy the next highest share, followed by a far third, plantation land and then thope land.

The major landlords have a higher share than the village average in each of the important income-bearing asset categories: crop land, other agricultural assets, thope land and plantation land. Medium landlords' assets are concentrated in crop land, thope land and nonagricultural assets; in the case of non-labouring small landholders predictably, nearly 95 per cent of assets are in crop land and nonagricultural assets.

At the other end of the scale, the assets of landless agricultural and nonagricultural worker households are concentrated almost entirely in nonagricultural assets -- assets other than means of production.

Among the peasantry, there is a generally diminishing importance in the significance of crop land as we move from the rich to the poorer sections of the peasantry -- this also reflects the fact of a higher incidence of tenancy and of ownership of lower quality land among the poor.

CONCLUSIONS FROM SECTIONS V AND VI

We can now briefly sum up the conclusions from the data on the distribution of land holdings and assets among households by size categories of land holdings and by our economic classification of households.

-- There is a high degree of concentration of ownership and operational holdings in the hands of households in the highest size categories, and correspondingly, among households belonging to the class of major landlords. These households corner the largest share of landholdings, and also own a disproportionately large share of the best land in the village: nanjai and thottam. Concentration of ownership and operational holdings is particularly marked in the more productive tracts -- nanjai and thottam -- where more modern techniques of production are gaining ground; it is less marked on punjai land, which represents the backward traditional sector of agriculture.

The concentration of ownership holdings in the hands of the landlords is greater than that of operational holdings.

The major landlords also have, on each type of land and in the aggregate, the largest holdings per household.

While in general the richer sections of the peasantry, as a class, own the next highest share of the land, this share is only a fraction of that held by the landlords; the average size of holding is, correspondingly, a small fraction of the average holding of a landlord household.

-- At the other end of the scale, landlessness characterises the majority of households; 69.36 per cent of households are landless in respect of ownership holdings, 65.63 per cent have no operational holdings and 60.34 per cent of households have neither ownership nor operational holdings. In class terms, agricultural labourers form the largest single class in the village: they constitute 48.93 per cent of the population. All manual labourer households (this includes households engaged in nonagricultural labour) constitute 53.39 per cent of the population. The class of agricultural labourers draws on almost every caste in the village; above all, on households of the scheduled castes.

-- The vast majority of households actually engaged in cultivation, and particularly the middle and poor sections of the peasantry and agricultural labourers with small plots of land, carry on production on very small holdings.

-- The bulk of land -- 82.97 per cent of ownership holdings -- are cultivated directly by owners of the land. In respect of the major landlords, 98.20 per cent of their ownership holdings are under direct cultivation. These are capitalist landlords, who employ hired -- predominantly wage -- labour to cultivate their fields. (They also extract labour service from agricultural labourers and other working sections; the significance of this form of labour in the aggregate of tasks directly associated with agricultural production, is however, declining.)

-- While over a long period, a large number of tenant cultivators have been evicted, and direct cultivation is now predominant, tenant cultivation is still significant -- in the aggregate, 17.40 per cent of the area of all operational holdings are leased in. Tenancy is particularly marked on nanjai and thottam tracts. Tenants, who pay rents that are far above the statutory levels, are drawn particularly from the middle and poorer sections of the peasantry and (particularly in the case of punjai operational holdings) from agricultural labourers; it is to be noted that there are also sections among the rich peasantry that lease in land and pay heavy rents. Land is leased in mainly from landowners who are resident outside Gokilapuram.

With respect to the distribution of assets, calculated in terms of rupee value, the major conclusions from our tables are as follows:

-- The concentration of wealth in terms of asset holdings in the hands of households in the top size categories of ownership holdings and, in class terms, among major landlord households is significantly higher than even the concentration of land holdings. This applies to all assets in the aggregate and to almost every individual asset category.

In every category of assets (except the two livestock categories) classes whose share in the total value of assets is second to that of the major landlords are very distant seconds; the assets that they own are a fraction of those held by landlords. In every category of assets without exception, the landlords have vastly higher average asset holdings per household than households in any other class.

-- The grip of the landlords on the total value of assets is particularly strong on the most productive, income-bearing assets: crop land, thope land, plantation land and other agricultural assets (consisting of implements and means of production). In respect of crop land and thope land, they have built on traditional holdings, and in some cases, have considerably enhanced these holdings over the last twenty years. Plantation cultivation on mainly virgin land located in the eastern Erasakkanayakanur hills and High Wavy range, is also concentrated in the hands of major landlords. Of particular significance is the extremely high concentration of the category of 'other agricultural assets' -- among households resident in the village the major landlords have a comprehensive hold over the most modern means of production, and together own almost three-quarters of the total value of assets in this group.

-- At the other end, the middle and poor sections of the peasantry and agricultural and other manual workers own a share of the total value of assets that is marginal in relation to that of the major landlords and in relation to the weight of their own numbers in the population; the data on the distribution of wealth between households in the village show a pattern that is glaringly unequal.

In respect of every asset group other than draught animals and other livestock each class among the middle and poor peasantry and agricultural and other manual labourers (i.e. each class from 4(3) through 4(6) and classes within 5 and 6) owns less <u>as a class</u> than the average asset holdings of <u>each</u> of the 13 landlord households. The average asset holding per household in each of these classes is lower, for every group of assets other than the two livestock categories, than the average for all households in the village as a whole.

This contrast is particularly striking in the case of landless agricultural labourers. There are 257 households in this category; in each asset group (other than the live-stock categories) their total holdings are a fraction of what is owned by each of the 13 major landlord households. The dominant feature of the asset holdings of these households is their emerging propertylessness in respect of ownership of means of production -- assets of these households are mainly concentrated in relatively minor household assets and small holdings of livestock.

******

As we have noted earlier, this report deals with the distribution of landholdings and assets between households at a point in time: in doing so, we have missed out on crucial issues relating to the description and analysis of the dynamics of transformation in the village and region. We have not dealt with, for example, qualitative aspects of the process of accumulation on the one hand and immiserisation on the other, and of changing agrarian relations in the village. We hope to take up, at a later stage, aspects of the processes of change in more detailed study, particularly in respect of the characteristics of agricultural labour, on which we are now working.

The data in this paper show that while inequality in the ownership of land and wealth in the village has taken new and more complex forms in the present period, wide disparity remains the overwhelming feature of the distribution of land and other assets in the village. There is a concentration of land and other productive assets in the hands of a small minority of rich households, in particular, the major land-lords, along with a relative deprivation of middle and poor peasants and agricultural labourers, who constitute the majority of households, of these assets. And as is apparent from the pattern of distribution of assets, unless the present system of ownership and production is broken, the sources of future accumulation of wealth lie primarily in the hands of those among whom wealth is concentrated today.

******

February, 1983

Acknowledgements

Susan Ram did field studies in the mid-seventies on the agrarian regime in the Cumbum Valley; her work led up to the survey of households in Gokilapuram village conducted in May 1977 from which the major part of the data in this report is drawn. Sixteen persons worked at data collection and another group at the initial extraction of data from schedules.

In doing the computation and tabulation of data for this paper, I was assisted by S. Alamelu and K. Jayashree; K. Nagaraj helped with suggestions on tabulation methods.

I am grateful to colleagues at MIDS -- particularly S. Guhan, C.T. Kurien and K. Nagaraj -- for detailed comments on a draft of this report. They have also taken time, as has John Harriss, for helpful discussion of issues raised, although inadequately worked out, in the paper. My warmest thanks are to N. Ram, who has commented in detail on the method and argument adopted in this survey report, and whose criticism of the report at different stages of its preparation -- including its present stage -- has been of great help.

I am also grateful to J. Robinson, V. Ramalingam and S. Parthasarathy for typing the text and appendix of tables, and to K.C. Devassy and L. Celine for doing the cyclostyling work.

****

APPENDIX OF TABLES

TO

WORKING PAPER NO. 31

APPENDIX OF TABLES: CONTENTS

Table No.	Title	Page/s
1	Annual compound rate of growth of population.	1
2	Number of males per thousand population	1
3	Literate persons as percent of total population	1
4	Persons of scheduled castes and tribes as percent of total population	2
5	Workers as percent of total population	2
6	Occupational classification of population: percentage distribution	3 & 4
9	Cropping pattern, Uthamapalayam taluk, 1970-71 and 1980-81	5 & 6
15	Castes of households, by economic classification	7 & 12
17	Distribution of ownership holdings between households, by size category of ownership holding	13-16
18	Distribution of operational holdings between households, by size category of operational holding	17-& 18
19	Distribution of nanjai ownership holdings among nanjai owner-households, by size category of nanjai ownership holding	19 & 20
20	Distribution of nanjai operational holdings among nanjai operator-households, by size category of nanjai operational holding	21 & 22
21	Distribution of punjai ownership holdings among punjai owner-households, by size category of punjai ownership holding	23 & 24
22	Distribution of punjai operational holdings among punjai operator-households, by size category of punjai operational holding	25 & 26
23	Distribution of thottam ownership holdings among thottam owner-households, by size category of thottam ownership holding	27 - 29
24	Distribution of thottam operational holdings among thottam operator-households, by size category of thottam operational holding	30 & 31
25	Distribution of operational holdings by size class of operational holding, Gokilapuram revenue village: from World Agricultural Census, Tamil Nadu, 1970-71	32
26	Distribution of ownership holdings among households, by economic classification	33 - 44

Table No.	Title	Page/s
27	Distribution of operational holdings among households, by economic classification	45 - 46
28	Average size of holding, by economic classification	57 & 58
29	Percentage share of nanjai, punjai and thottam in the ownership and operational holdings of each class	59 & 60
38	Assets of households, by size category of ownership holding	61 - 64
39	Assets owned by households, by economic classification	65 - 68
40	Asset holdings: average asset holdings by asset category, by class	69 & 70

* * *

TABLE 1: ANNUAL COMPOUND RATE OF GROWTH OF POPULATION (in %)

	1961-1971	1971-1981
TAMIL NADU	2.03	1.60
MADURAI DISTRICT	2.06	1.41
UTHAMAPALAYAM TALUK	1.88	1.07
GOKILAPURAM VILLAGE	1.35	0.57

Source: Census of India

TABLE 2: NUMBER OF MALES PER THOUSAND POPULATION

	1961	1971	1981
TAMIL NADU	502	506	506
MADURAI DISTRICT	501	504	506
UTHAMAPALAYAM TALUK	501	502	507
GOKILAPURAM VILLAGE	525	513	510

Source: Census of India

TABLE 3: LITERATE PERSONS AS PERCENT OF TOTAL POPULATION

	1961			1971			1981		
	P	M	F	P	M	F	P	M	F
TAMIL NADU	31.41	44.54	18.17	39.46	51.78	26.86	45.78	57.19	34.12
MADURAI DISTRICT	33.38	48.12	18.62	41.51	55.07	27.77	46.58	58.82	34.06
UTHAMAPALAYAM TALUK	32.35	46.98	17.64	41.31	55.30	27.18	47.39	60.27	34.14
GOKILAPURAM VILLAGE	39.23	56.20	20.47	41.21	53.32	28.47	48.19	61.53	34.30

Source: Census of India

TABLE 4: PERSONS OF SCHEDULED CASTES AND TRIBES AS PERCENT OF TOTAL POPULATION

	1961	1971	1981
TAMIL NADU	18.76	18.51	n.a
MADURAI DISTRICT	15.43	15.10	n.a
UTHAMAPALAYAM TALUK	12.41	13.29	13.78
GOKILAPURAM VILLAGE	20.35	18.97	23.24

Source: Census of India

TABLE 5: WORKERS AS PERCENT OF TOTAL POPULATION

	1961	1971	1981 (Main Workers)	1981 (Main + Marginal Workers)
TAMIL NADU	45.57	35.78	39.15	42.60
MADURAI DISTRICT	45.45	36.92	42.33	48.81
UTHAMAPALAYAM TALUK	43.85	39.95	46.90	45.98
GOKILAPURAM VILLAGE	41.99	52.00	48.31	58.05

Source: Census of India

TABLE 6: OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF POPULATION: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION

VILLAGE

	1961 P	1961 M	1961 F	1971 P	1971 M	1971 F	(Main Workers) 1981 P	(Main Workers) 1981 M	(Main Workers) 1981 F
CULTIVATOR	40.79	43.38	36.50	27.04	33.77	18.81	20.04	23.97	13.88
AGRICULTURAL LABOUR	4.31	4.81	3.50	61.30	49.25	76.03	59.97	50.26	75.20
MINING, QUARRYING, LIVESTOCK, FORESTRY, FISHING, HUNTING, PLANTATIONS, ORCHARDS & ALLIED ACTIVITIES.	0.22	0.35	0	0	0	0			
MANUFACTURING (Household Industry)	2.41	3.52	0.58	2.53	4.13	0.57			
MANUFACTURING (Other than household Industry)	0.73	1.17	0	0.46	0.65	0.23	19.99	25.77	10.92
CONSTRUCTION	0.15	0.23	0	0.26	0.47	0			
TRADE & COMMERCE	3.87	5.16	1.75	2.68	4.41	0.57			
TRANSPORT, STORAGE, COMMUNICATIONS	0.07	0.12	0	0.21	0.38	0			
OTHER SERVICES	47.44	41.27	57.67	5.52	6.94	3.78			

TABLE 6 (contd.)

TALUK

	1961 P	1961 M	1961 F	1971 P	1971 M	1971 F	(Main Workers)1981 P	(Main Workers)1981 M	(Main Workers)1981 F
CULTIVATOR	31.96	33.77	28.62	24.10	28.75	13.55	18.32	21.54	13.95
AGRICULTURAL LABOUR	21.93	18.72	27.83	54.23	44.56	76.18	57.30	47.74	74.02
MINING, QUARRYING, LIVESTOCK, FORESTRY, FISHING, HUNTING, PLANTATIONS, ORCHARDS & ALLIED ACTIVITIES	5.04	5.71	3.81	3.07	3.00	3.23			
MANUFACTURING (Household Industry)	2.45	2.85	1.70	1.69	2.18	0.58			
MANUFACTURING (Other than Household Industry)	2.89	4.09	0.67	2.37	3.25	0.36	24.38	32.06	11.86
CONSTRUCTION	0.86	1.19	0.26	0.72	0.93	0.23			
TRADE & COMMERCE	5.62	7.67	1.87	6.37	8.63	1.22			
TRANSPORT, STORAGE, COMMUNICATIONS	0.56	0.85	0:03	0.75	1.07	0.02			
OTHER SERVICES	28.69	25.14	35.21	6.70	7.62	4.63			

Source: Census of India

TABLE 9: CROPPING PATTERN, UTHAMAPALAYAM TALUK, 1970-71 & 1980-81

(in acres)

CROP/CROP CATEGORY	GROSS CROPPED AREA, 1970-71			GROSS CROPPED AREA, 1980-81		
	Irrigated	Unirrigated	Total	Irrigated	Unirrigated	Total
Rice	29079	59	29138	32493	0	32,493
Cholam	11239	39906	51145	7268	24710	31978
Cumbu	521	1039	1560	2164	976	3140
Ragi & Other cereals	10278	15402	25680	2475	14924	17399
Pulses	101	3906	4007	964	8185	9149
Total Foodgrain	51218	60312	111530	45364	48795	94159
Condiments	2729	1292	4021	1707	1978	3685
Orchards	2864	2390	5254	8644	1872	10516
Vegetables	1208	98	1306	4195	113	4308
Cotton	7868	1227	9095	15548	1209	16757
Sugarcane	54	46	100	375	0	375
Groundnut	1342	29547	30889	6747	18496	25243
Coconut	876	464	1340	3364	187	3551
Gingelly	6	228	234	38	5287	5325
Other oil seeds	7	33	40	18	63	81
Others	441	4249	4690	834	4771	5605
Total Non-foodgrain Crops	17395	39574	56969	41470	33976	75446
Total	68613	99886	168499	86834	82771	169605

TABLE 9 (contd.)

	Percentage share of crops and crop categories in gross cropped area						Percentage decadal change in gross cropped Area		
	1970-71			1980-81					
	Irrigated	Unirrigated	Total	Irrigated	Unirrigated	Total	Irrigated	Unirrigated	Total
Rice	42.38	0.06	17.29	37.42	0	19.16	11.74	-	11.51
Cholam	16.38	39.95	30.35	8.37	29.85	18.86	(-) 35.33	(-) 38.08	(-) 37.48
Cumbu	0.76	1.04	0.93	2.49	1.18	1.85	315.35	(-) 6.06	101.28
Ragi & other cereals	14.98	15.42	15.24	2.85	18.03	10.26	(-) 75.92	(-) 3.10	(-) 32.25
Pulses	0.15	3.91	2.38	1.11	9.89	5.39	854.45	109.55	128.32
Total Foodgrain	74.65	60.38	66.19	52.24	58.95	55.52	(-) 11.43	(-) 19.10	(-) 15.57
Condiments	3.98	1.29	2.39	1.97	2.39	2.17	(-) 37.45	53.10	(-) 8.36
Orchards	4.17	2.39	3.12	9.96	2.26	6.20	201.82	(-) 21.76	100.15
Vegetables	1.76	0.10	0.78	4.83	0.14	2.54	247.27	15.31	229.86
Cotton	11.46	1.23	5.40	17.91	1.46	9.88	97.61	(-) 1.47	84.24
Sugarcane	0.08	0.05	0.06	0.43	0	0.22	594.44	-	275.00
Groundnut	1.96	29.58	18.33	7.77	22.34	14.88	402.76	(-) 37.40	(-) 18.28
Coconut	1.28	0.47	0.79	3.87	0.23	2.09	284.02	(-) 59.70	165.00
Gingelly	0.01	0.23	0.14	0.04	6.39	3.14	533.33	2218.85	2175.64
Other oil seeds	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.08	0.05	157.14	90.91	102.50
Others	0.64	4.25	2.78	0.96	5.76	3.31	89.12	12.28	19.51
Total Non-food grain crops	25.35	39.62	33.81	47.76	41.05	44.48	138.44	(-) 14.15	32.43
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	26.56	(-) 17.13	0.66

Source: Revenue records 1980-81 Uthamapalayam taluk and WAC, 1970-71.

TABLE 15: CASTES OF HOUSEHOLDS, BY ECONOMIC CLASSIFICATION

Group	All Households			Maravar			Kallar		
	no.	percent		no.	percent		no.	percent	
1. Major Landlords	11	1.69	100	4	2.12	36.36			
2. Medium Landlords	10	1.54	100	9	4.79	90.00			
3. Nonlabouring small landowners	11	1.69	100	6	3.19	54.55			
4. Peasants									
(1) $\geq 0 \leq 0.249$	23	3.54	100	18	9.57	78.26	2	2.63	8.70
(2) 0.250-0.749	19	2.92	100	5	2.66	26.32	7	9.21	36.84
(3) 0.750-1.249	8	1.23	100	5	2.66	62.50	1	1.32	12.50
(4) 1.250-1.999	16	2.46	100	6	3.19	37.50	5	6.58	31.25
(5) 2.000-4.999	26	4.00	100	8	4.26	30.77	9	11.84	34.61
(6) $\geq$ 5.000	12	1.85	100	4	2.13	33.33	2	2.63	16.67
5. Agricultural Labourers									
(1)a. ownership and operational	30	4.62	100	10	5.32	33.33	3	3.95	10.00
(1)b. operational, no ownership	17	2.62	100	3	1.60	17.65	4	5.26	23.53
(1)c. ownership, no operational	14	2.15	100	4	2.13	28.57	3	3.95	21.43
(2) neither own, nor op.	257	39.54	100	66	35.11	25.68	24	31.57	9.34
6. Nonagricultural Labourers									
(1) ownership &/or op.	8	1.23	100	3	1.60	37.50	1	1.32	12.50
(2) neither own nor op.	21	3.23	100	4	2.13	19.05	1	1.32	4.76
7. Main income from business activity other than agriculture									
(1) ownership &/or op.	23	3.54	100	5	2.66	21.73	2	2.63	8.70
(2) neither own nor op.	57	8.77	100	13	6.91	22.80	5	6.58	8.77
8. Artisanal activity, traditional calling									
(1) ownership &/or op.	13	2.00	100						
(2) neither own, nor op.	23	3.54	100						
9. Salaried persons, professionals									
(1) ownership &/or op.	9	1.38	100	4	2.13	44.44	3	3.95	33.33
(2) neither own, nor op.	24	3.69	100	6	3.19	25.00	2	2.63	8.33
10. Small rents, remittance, OAP, etc.									
(1) ownership &/or op.	5	0.77	100	1	0.53	20.00	1	1.32	20.00
(2) neither own nor op.	6	0.92	100	2	1.06	33.33			
11. UNCL.	7	1.08	100	2	1.06	28.57	1	1.32	14.29
TOTAL	650	100	100	188	100	28.92	76	100	11.69

TABLE 15 (contd.)

Group	Telugu Chettiar no.	percent		Pallar no.	percent		Parayar no.	percent	
1. Major Landlords	7	10.14	63.64						
2. Medium Landlords	1	1.45	10.00						
3. Nonlabouring small Landowners	2	2.90	18.18						
4. Peasants									
(1)1≥0≤0.249				1	1.01	4.35			
(2) 0.250-0.749	1	1.45	5.26				1	2.70	5.26
(3) 0.750-1.249	1	1.45	12.50						
(4) 1.250-1.999				3	3.03	18.75			
(5) 2.000-4.999	1	1.45	3.85	7	7.07	26.92			
(6)≥5.000				5	5.05	41.67	1	2.70	8.33
5. Agricultural labourers									
(1) a. ownership and operational	3	4.35	10.00	6	6.06	20.00	2	5.41	6.67
(1) b. operational, no ownership	3	4.35	17.65	3	3.03	17.65	2	5.41	11.76
(1) c. ownership, no operational									
(2) neither own, nor op.	17	24.63	6.61	69	69.70	26.85	23	62.16	8.94
6. Nonagricultural labourers.		[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]	
(1) Ownership &/or op.							1	2.70	12.50
(2) neither own nor op.	1	1.45	4.76	1	1.01	4.76	4	10.81	19.05
7. Main income from business activity other than agriculture									
(1) ownership &/or op.	10	14.49	43.47				1	2.70	4.35
(2) neither own nor op.	15	21.74	26.32	2	2.02	3.51			
8. Artisanal activity, traditional calling									
(1) ownership &/or op.									
(2) neither own, nor op.									
9. Salaried persons, professionals		[illegible]							
(1) ownership &/or op.									
(2) neither own, nor op.	2	2.90	8.33	1	1.01	4.17	2	5.41	8.33
10. Small rents, remittance, OAP, etc.									
(1) ownership &/or op.	3	4.35	60.00						
(2) neither own nor op.	1	1.45	16.67	1	1.01	16.67			
11. UNCL	1	1.45	14.29						
TOTAL	69	100	10.62	99	100	15.23	37	100	5.69

Group	Chakkiliyar no.	percent		Unspecified S.C. no.	percent		Achari no.	percent	
1. Major Landlords									
2. Medium Landlords									
3. Nonlabouring small landowners							1	2.27	9.09
4. Peasants									
(1) I ≥0 ≤ 0.249									
(2) 0.250-0.749							3	6.82	15.79
(3) 0.750-1.249							3	6.82	15.79
(4) 1.250-1.999									
(5) 2.000-4.999	1	6.67	3,85						
(6) ≥ 5.000	1	6.[illegible]							
5. Agricultural Labourers									
(1)a. ownership and operational							1	2.27	3.33
(1)b. operational, no ownership	1	6.67	5.88						
(1)c. ownership, no operational							4	9.09	28.57
(2) neither own, nor op.	11	73.33	4.28	7	53.84	2.72	14	31.82	5.45
6. Nonagricultural Labourers									
(1) ownership &/or op.							1	2.27	12.50
(2) neither own nor op.	1	6.67	4.76	3	23.08	14.29	2	4.55	9.52
7. Main income from business activity other than agriculture									
(1) ownership &/or op.							1	2.27	4.35
(2) neither own, nor op.							1	2.27	1.75
8. Artisanal activity, traditional calling									
(1) ownership &/or op.							6	13.64	46.15
(2) neither own nor op.	1	6.67	4.35	3	23.08	13.04	8	18.18	34.78
9. Salaried persons, professionals									
(1) ownership &/or op.							2	4.55	22.22
(2) neither own, nor op.									
10. Small rents, remittance, OAP, etc.									
(1) ownership &/or op.									
(2) neither own, nor op.									
11. UNCL.									
TOTAL	15	100	2.31	13	100	2.00	44	100	6.77

TABLE 15 (contd.)

Group	Pot-maker* no.	percent		Vannar no.	percent		Karkatha Vellalar no.	percent	
1. Major Landlords									
2. Medium Landlords									
3. Nonlabouring small landowners	1	3.12	9.09				1	11.11	9.09
4. Peasants									
(1) 1>0< 0.249	2	6.25	8.70						
(2) 0.250-0.749	1	3.12	5.26				1	11.11	5.26
(3) 0.750-1.249									
(4) 1.250-1.999									
(5) 2.000-4.999									
(6) ≥ 5.000									
5. Agricultural Labourers									
(1) a. ownership and operational	4	12.50	13.33						
(1) b. operational no ownership									
(1) c. ownership, no operational	2	6.25	14.29						
(2) neither own, nor op.	11	34.38	4.28				1	11.11	0.39
6. Nonagricultural Labourers									
(1) ownership &/or op.							1	11.11	12.50
(2) neither own nor op.	1	3.12	4.76						
7. Main income from business activity other than agriculture									
(1) ownership &/or op.	2	6.25	8.70	1	9.09	4.35	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
(2) neither own nor op.	2	6.25	3.51				2	22.22	3.51
8. Artisanal activity, traditional calling									
(1) ownership &/or op.	3	9.38	23.08	4	36.36	30.77			
(2) neither own, nor op.				6	54.55	26.09			
9. Salaried persons, professionals									
(1) ownership &/or op.									
(2) neither own nor op.	2	6.25	8.33				1	11.11	4.17
10. Small rents, remittance, OAP etc.									
(1) ownership &/or op.									
(2) neither own nor op.							2	22.22	33.33
UNCL	1	3.12	14.29						
TOTAL	32	100	4.92	11	100	1.69	9	100	1.39

* Kuyavar, Kusavar, Vellala Chettiar, Kullalar Chettiar.

Group	Kodikal Vellalar no.	Kodikal Vellalar percent		Thuluva Vellalar no.	Thuluva Vellalar percent		Nadar no.	Nadar percent	
1. Major landlords									
2. Medium landlords									
3. Nonlabouring small landowners									
4. Peasants									
(1) 1 ≥0 ≤ 0.249									
(2) 0.250-0.749									
(3) 0.750-1.249							1	7.14	12.50
(4) 1.250-1.999							1	7.14	6.25
(5) 2.000-4.999									
(6) ≥ 5.000									
5. Agricultural Labourers									
(1)a. ownership and operational									
(1)b. operational, no ownership									
(1)c. ownership no operational				1	20.00	7.14			
(2) neither own, nor op.	4	50.00	1.56	1	20.00	0.39	4	28.57	1.56
6. Nonagricultural labourers.									
(1) ownership &/or op.	1	12.50	12.50						
(2) neither own nor op.	3	37.50	14.29						
7. Main income from business activity other than agriculture									
(1) ownership &/or op.							1	7.14	4.35
(2) neither own nor op.							7	50.00	12.28
8. Artisanal activity, traditional calling									
(1) ownership &/or op.									
(2) neither own nor op.									
9. Salaried persons, professionals									
(1) ownership &/or op.									
(2) neither own nor op.				2	40.00	8.33			
10. Small rents, remittance, OAP, etc.									
(1) ownership &/or op.									
(2) neither own nor op.									
11. UNCL.				1	20.00	14.29			
TOTAL	8	100	1.23	5	100	0.77	14	100	2.15

Group	Komati no.	percent		Others no.	percent		UNSPECIFIED no.	percent	
1. Major landlords									
2. Medium landlords									
3. Nonlabouring small landowners									
4. Peasants									
(1) 1>0<0.249									
(2) 0.250-0.749									
(3) 0.750-1.249									
(4) 1.250-1.999				1	6.25	6.25			
(5) 2.000-4.999									
(6) > 5.000									
5. Agricultural Labourers									
(1)a. ownership and operational				1	6.25	3.33			
(2)b operational, no ownership				1	6.25	5.88			
(3)c. ownership, no operational									
(4)neither own, nor op.				4	25.00	1.50	1	11.11	0.39
6. Nonagricultural Labourers									
(1) ownership &/or op.									
(2) neither own nor op.									
7. Main income from business activity other than agriculture									
(1) Ownership &/or op.									
(2) neither own nor op.	4	80	7.02	2	12.50	3.51	4	44.44	7.02
8. Artisanal activity, traditional calling									
(1) ownership &/or op.									
(2) neither own nor op.				3	18.75	13.04	2	22.22	8.70
9. Salaried persons, professionals									
(1) ownership &/or op.									
(2) neither own, nor op.	1	80	4.17	3	18.75	12.50	2	22.22	8.33
10. Small rents, remittance, etc.									
(1) ownership &/or op.									
(2) neither own nor op.									
UNCL.				1	6.25	14.29			
Σ	5	100	0.77	16	100	2.46	9	100	1.39

NOTE: There are three columns against each caste group. The first represents the number of households, the second are percentages to column totals and the third percentages to row totals.

TABLE 17: DISTRIBUTION OF OWNERSHIP HOLDINGS BETWEEN HOUSEHOLDS, BY SIZE CATEGORY OF OWNERSHIP HOLDING.

	Size-class of ownership holding	Number of house-holds	(2) as percent of column Total	Owner house-holds in group as percent of all owner house-holds	Area owned and operated with family and/or hired labour			Area leased out		
						(5) as per cent of			(8) as per cent of	
					Extent	Column Total	Row Total	Extent	Column Total	Row Total
	Acres (Hectares)				Acres			Acres		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1A	0	58	9.02			0			0	
1B	0	267	41.52			0			0	
1C	0	121	18.82			0			0	
2	0-0.62 (0-0.25)	23	3.58	11.67	6.38	0.97	65.57	2.45	2.67	25.18
3	0.62-1.24 (0.25-0.50)	39	6.07	19.80	25.42	3.89	61.88	12.29	13.40	29.92
4	1.24-2.47 (0.50-1.00)	42	6.53	21.32	52.74	8.06	65.52	16.25	17.72	20.18
5	2.47-4.94 (1.00-2.00)	49	7.62	24.87	120.47	18.42	70.71	33.15	36.14	19.46
6	4.94-9.88 (2.00-4.00)	28	4.35	14.21	154.41	23.61	82.21	23.40	25.51	12.46

(contd.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
7	9.88-14.82 (4.00-6.00)	6	0.93	3.05	64.45	9.85	97.73	1.50	1.64	2.27
8	14.82-19.76 (6.00-8.00)	5	0.78	2.54	76.16	11.64	98.73	0.98	1.07	1.27
9	19.76-24.70 (8.00-10.00)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	> 24.70 (> 10.00)	5	0.78	2.54	153.99	23.55	98.91	1.70	1.85	1.09
Total		643	100	100	654.02	100	82.97	91.72	100	11.63

TABLE: 17(contd.)

	Area Mortgaged out			Total area of ownership holdings			Average size of Household ownership holding
		(11) as per-cent of			(14) as per-cent of		
	Extent	Column Total	Row Total	Extent	Column Total	Row Total	
	Acres (11)	(12)	(13)	Acres (14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
1A		0			0		
1B		0			0		
1C		0			0		
2	0:90	2.12	9.25	9.73	1.23	100	0.42
3	3:37	7:92	8:20	41.08	5.21	100	1.05
4	11.50	27.03	14.29	80.49	10.21	100	1.91
5	16:75	39.58	9.83	170.37	21.61	100	3.48
6	10.02	23.55	5.33	187.83	23.83	100	6.71

(contd.)

TABLE: 17 (contd.)

	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
7	0	0	0	65.95	8.37	100	10.99
8	0	0	0	77.14	9.79	100	15.43
9	0	0	0	0	0		0
10	1.09	0	0	155.69	19.75	100	31.14
Total	48.54	100	5.40	788.28	100	100	4.00*

*Average holding of owner-households only

TABLE 18: DISTRIBUTION OF OPERATIONAL HOLDINGS AMONG HOUSEHOLDS, BY SIZE CATEGORY OF OPERATIONAL HOLDINGS

	Size class of operational holding	Number of households	(2) as percent of column total	Operator-households in group as percent of all operator households	Area owned and operated with family and/or hired labour			Area leased in		
						(5) as percent of			(8) as percent of	
					Extent	Column Total	Row Total	Extent	Column Total	Row Total
	Acres (Hectares) (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Acres (5)	(6)	(7)	Acres (8)	(9)	(10)
1A	0	34	5.29		0	0		0	0	
1B	0	267	41.52		0	0		0	0	
1C	0	121	18.82		0	0		0	0	
2	0-0.62 (0-0.25)	25	3.89	11.31	7.38	1.13	73.36	1.96	1.33	19.48
3	0.62-1.24 (0.25-0.50)	39	6.07	17.65	18.50	2.83	46.88	17.72	12.02	44.91
4	1.24-2.47 (0.50-1.00)	51	7.93	23.08	52.80	8.07	54.92	37.94	25.74	39.46
5	2.47-4.94 (1.00-2.00)	60	9.33	27.15	118.41	18.09	58.32	58.22	39.50	28.68
6	4.94-9.88 (2.00-4.00)	29	4.51	13.12	154.12	23.55	81.24	28.25	19.17	14.89
7	9.88-14.82 (4.00-6.00)	8	1.24	3.62	87.81	13.42	94.05	3.31	2.25	3.54
8	14.82-19.76 (6.00-8.00)	4	0.62	1.81	61.41	9.38	100.00	0	0	0
9	19.76-24.70 (8.00-10.00)	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0
10	> 24.70 (> 10.00)	5	0.76	2.26	153.99	23.53	100.00	0	0	0
Total	Total	643	100.00	100.00	654.42	100.00	77.05	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

TABLE 18 (contd).

	Area Mortgaged in			Total area of operational holding			Average size of household operational holding
		(11) as per-cent of			(14) as per-cent of		
	Extent	Column Total	Row Total	Extent	Column Total	Row Total	
	Acres (11)	(12)	(13)	Acres (14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
1A	0	0	-	0	-	-	-
1B	0	0	-	0	-	-	-
1C	0	0	-	0	-	-	-
2	0.72	1.59	7.16	10.06	1.19	100	0.40
3	3.24	7.14	8.21	39.46	4.66	100	1.01
4	5.40	11.91	5.62	96.14	11.35	100	1.88
5	26.40	58.20	13.00	203.03	23.96	100	3.38
6	7.35	16.20	3.87	189.72	22.39	100	6.54
7	2.25	4.96	2.41	93.37	11.02	100	11.67
8	0	0	0	61.41	7.25	100	15.35
9	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
10	0	0	0	153.99	18.18	100	30.80
Total	45.36	100.00	5.35	847.18	100.00	100.00	100

TABLE 19: DISTRIBUTION OF NANJAI OWNERSHIP HOLDINGS AMONG NANJAI OWNER HOUSEHOLDS, BY SIZE CATEGORY OF NANJAI OWNERSHIP HOLDING

	Size class of Nanjai ownership holding	Number of Nanjai owner households	(2) as percent of Column Total	Nanjai area owned and operated with family and/or hired labour			Nanjai area leased out		
				Extent	(4) as percent of Column Total	(4) as percent of Row Total	Extent	(7) as percent of Column Total	(7) as percent of Row Total
	Acres (Hectares)			Acres			Acres		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2	0-0.62 (0-0.25)	35	46.05	10.45	6.65	79.05	1.75	17.99	13.24
3	0.62-1.24 (0.25-0.50)	17	22.37	12.95	8.25	72.96	3.60	37.00	20.28
4	1.24-2.47 (0.50-1.00)	8	10.52	11.27	7.18	81.49	0	0	0
5	2.47-4.94 (1.00-2.00)	6	7.90	19.34	12.31	98.47	0.30	3.08	1.43
6	4.94-9.88 (2.00-4.00)	6	7.90	38.81	24.71	84.74	3.58	36.79	7.82
7	9.88-14.82 (4.00-6.00)	2	2.63	22.75	14.48	100	0	0	0
8	>14.82 (>6.00)	2	2.63	41.50	26.42	98.81	0.50	5.14	1.19
	Total	76	100	157.07	100	89.76	9.73	100	5.56

TABLE 19 (contd.)

	Nanjai area mortgaged out			Total area of Nanjai ownership holdings			Average size of household Nanjai ownership holding
	Extent	(10) as per-cent of Column Total	(10) as per-cent of Row Total	Extent	(13) as percent of Column Total	(13) as percent of Row Total	
	Acres 10	11	12	Acres 13	14	15	16
2	1.02	12.45	7.71	13.22	7.56	100	0.38
3	1.20	14.65	6.76	17.75	10.14	100	1.04
4	2.56	31.27	18.51	13.83	7.90	100	1.73
5	0	0	0	19.64	11.22	100	3.27
6	3.41	41.64	7.44	45.80	26.18	100	7.63
7	0	0	0	22.75	13.00	100	11.38
8	0	0	0	42.00	24.00	100	21.00
Total	8.19	100	4.68	174.99	100	100	2.30

TABLE 20: DISTRIBUTION OF NANJAI OPERATIONAL HOLDINGS AMONG NANJAI OPERATOR HOUSEHOLDS, BY SIZE CATEGORY OF NANJAI OPERATIONAL HOLDING

	Size class of Nanjai operational holding	Number of Nanjai operator house holds	(2) as percent of column total	Nanjai area owned and operated with family and/or hired labour			Nanjai area leased in		
				Extent	(4) as percent of Column Total	(4) as percent of Row Total	Extent	(7) as percent of Column Total	(7) as percent of Row Total
	Acres (Hectares)			Acres			Acres		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2	0-0.62 (0-0.25)	38	37.26	9.90	6.29	65.82	5.02	11.37	33.38
3	0.62-1.24 (0.25-0.50)	28	27.45	11.65	7.40	41.25	16.14	36.54	57.15
4	1.24-2.47 (0.50-1.00)	19	18.63	13.87	8.81	43.10	18.31	41.45	56.90
5	2.47-4.94 (1.00-2.00)	8	7.84	20.49	13.01	81.34	4.70	10.64	18.66
6	4.94-9.88 (2.00-4.00)	5	4.90	37.31	23.69	100	0	0	0
7	9.88-14.82 (4.00-6.00)	2	1.96	22.75	14.45	100	0	0	0
8	>14.82 (>6.00)	2	1.96	41.50	26.35	100	0	0	0
	Total	102	100	157.47	100	77.87	44.17	100	21.84

TABLE 20 (contd.)

	Nanjai area mortgaged in			Total area of Nanjai operational holdings			Average size of Nanjai household operational holding
	Extent	(10) as per-cent of Column Total	(10) as per-cent of Row Total	Extent	(13) as per-cent of Column Total	(13) as per-cent of Row Total	
	Acres			Acres			Acres
	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
2	0.12	21.05	0.80	15.04	7.44	100	0.40
3	0.45	78.95	1.60	28.24	13.97	100	1.01
4	0	0	0	32.18	15.91	100	1.69
5	0	0	0	25.19	12.46	100	3.15
6	0	0	0	37.31	18.45	100	7.46
7	0	0	0	22.75	11.25	100	11.38
8	0	0	0	41.50	20.52	100	20.75
Total	0.57	100	0.29	202.21	100	100	1.98

TABLE 21: DISTRIBUTION OF PUNJAI OWNERSHIP HOLDINGS AMONG PUNJAI OWNER HOUSEHOLDS, BY SIZE CATEGORY OF PUNJAI OWNERSHIP HOLDING.

	Size class of Punjai ownership holding	Number of Punjai owner house-holds	(2) as percent of Column Total	Punjai area owned and operated with family and/or hired labour			Punjai area leased out		
				Extent	(4) as percent of Column Total	(4) as percent of Row Total	Extent	(7) as percent of Column Total	(7) as percent of Row Total
	Acres (Hectares)			Acres			Acres		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2	0-0.62 (0-0.25)	13	8.13	3.80	1.03	62.29	1.50	2.43	24.59
3	0.62-1.24 (0.25 - 0.50)	30	18.75	22.09	5.96	69.93	7.10	11.51	22.47
4	1.24-2.47 (0.50 - 1.00)	53	33.12	66.97	18.08	69.56	18.80	30.49	19.53
5	2.47-4.94 (1.00 - 2.00)	42	26.25	110.83	29.91	72.16	24.67	40.00	16.06
6	4.94-9.88 (2.00-4.00)	18	11.25	105.80	28.56	91.32	9.60	15.57	8.29
7	9.88-14.82 (4.00-6.00)	2	1.25	20.00	5.40	100	0	0	0
8	>14.82 (>6.00)	2	1.25	41.00	11.06	100	0	0	0
	Total	160	100	370.49	100	79.78	61.67	100	13.28

TABLE 21 (contd.)

	Punjai area mortgaged out			Total area of Punjai ownership holding			Average size of household Punjai ownership holding
	Extent	(10) as percent of Column Total	(10) as percent of Row Total	Extent	(13) as percent of Column Total	(13) as percent of Row Total	
	Acres			Acres			Acres
	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
2	0.80	2.48	13.12	6.10	1.31	100	0.47
3	2.40	7.44	7.60	31.59	6.80	100	1.05
4	10.50	32.56	10.91	96.27	20.73	100	1.82
5	18.10	56.12	11.78	153.60	33.07	100	3.16
6	0.45	1.40	0.39	115.85	24.95	100	6.44
7	0	0	0	20.00	4.31	100	10.00
8	0	0	0	41.00	8.83	100	20.50
Total	32.25	100	6.94	464.41	100	100	2.90

TABLE 22: DISTRIBUTION OF PUNJAI OPERATIONAL HOLDINGS AMONG PUNJAI OPERATOR HOUSEHOLDS, BY SIZE CATEGORY OF PUNJAI OPERATIONAL HOLDING

	Size class of Punjai operational holding	Number of Punjai operator households	(2) as percent of Column Total	Punjai area owned and operated with family and/or hired labour			Punjai area leased in		
				Extent	(4) as percent of Column Total	(4) as percent of Row Total	Extent	(7) as percent of Column Total	(7) as percent of Row Total
	Acres (Hectares)			Acres			Acres		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2	0-0.62 (0-0.25)	11	6.92	3.80	1.03	67.86	0.60	1.08	10.71
3	0.62-1.24 (0.25-0.50)	31	19.50	20.19	5.45	62.45	7.70	13.84	23.82
4	1.24-2.47 (0.50-1.00)	53	33.33	69.63	18.79	71.58	18.90	33.96	19.43
5	2.47-4.94 (1.00-2.00)	45	28.30	116.52	31.45	72.70	28.45	51.12	17.75
6	4.94-9.88 (2.00-4.00)	15	9.43	99.35	26.82	100	0	0	0
7	9.88-14.82 (4.00-6.00)	2	1.26	20.00	5.40	100	0	0	0
8	>14.82 (> 6.00)	2	1.26	41.00	11.06	100	0	0	0
	Total	159	100	370.49	100	81.28	55.65	100	12.21

TABLE 22 (contd.)

	Punjai area mortgaged in			Total area of punjai operational holding			Average size of household punjai operational holding
		(10) as percent of			(13) as percent of		
	Extent	Column Total	Row Total	Extent	Column Total	Row Total	
	Acres			Acres			Acres
	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
2	1.20	4.04	21.43	5.60	1.23	100	0.51
3	4.44	14.96	13.73	32.33	7.09	100	1.04
4	8.75	29.47	8.99	97.28	21.34	100	1.83
5	15.30	51.53	9.55	160.27	35.16	100	3.56
6	0	0	0	99.35	21.79	100	6.62
7	0	0	0	20.00	4.39	100	10.00
8	0	0	0	41.00	9.00	100	20.50
Total	29.69	100	6.51	455.83	100	100	2.86

TABLE 23: DISTRIBUTION OF THOTTAM OWNERSHIP HOLDINGS AMONG THOTTAM OWNER HOUSEHODS BY SIZE CATEGORY OF THOTTAM OWNERSHIP HOLDING

Size class of Thottam Ownership Holding	Number of Thottam Owner Households	(2) As Percent of Column Total	Thottam Area Owned And Operated with Family And/ Or Hired Labour		
			Extent	(4) As Percent of Column Total	(4) As Percent of Row Total
Acres (Hectares)			Acres		
1	2	3	4	5	6
2. 0-0.62 (0-0.25)	6	9.52	1.55	1.23	46.27
3. 0.62-1.24 (0.25-0.50)	16	25.40	10.33	8.17	64.56
4. 1.24-2.47 (0.50-1.00)	25	39.68	35.51	28.08	80.78
5. 2.47-4.94 (1.00-2.00)	8	12.70	21.20	16.76	84.80
6. 4.94-9.88 (2.00-4.00)	7	11.11	47.87	37.85	94.66
7. >9.88 (>4.00)	1	1.59	10.00	7.91	100.00
Total	63	100.00	126.46	100.00	84.94

TABLE 23:(contd)

Size class of Thottam Ownership Holding	Thottam Leased Out			Thottam Mortgaged Out		
	Extent	(7) As Percentage Column Total	(7) As Percentage Row Total	Extent	(10) As Percentage Column Total	(10) As Percentage Row Total
Acres (Hectares)	Acres			Acres		
1	7	8	9	10	11	12
2. 0-0.62 (0-0.25)	0.60	2.95	17.91	1.20	57.14	35.82
3. 0.62-1.24 (0.25-0.50)	5.67	27.90	35.44	0	0	0
4. 1.24-2.47 (0.50-1.00)	7.55	37.16	17.17	0.90	42.86	2.05
5. 2.47-4.94 (1.00-2.00)	3.80	18.70	15.20	0	0	0
6. 4.94-9.88 (2.00-4.00)	2.70	13.29	5.34	0	0	0
7. >9.88 (>4.00)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	20.32	100.00	13.65	2.10	100.00	1.41

TABLE 23: (contd)

Size class of Thottam Ownership Holding	Total Area of Thottam Ownership Holding: Extent	(13) As Percent of Column Total	(13) As Percent of Row Total	Average Size of Household Thottam Ownership Holding
Acres (Hectares)	Acres			Acres
1	13	14	15	16
2. 0-0.62 (0-0.25)	3.35	2.25	100	0.59
3. 0.62-1.24 (0.25-0.50)	16.00	10.75	100	1.00
4. 1.24-2.47 (0.50-1.00)	43.96	29.53	100	1.76
5. 2.47-4.94 (1.00-2.00)	25.00	16.79	100	3.13
6. 4.94-9.88 (2.00-4.00)	50.57	33.97	100	7.22
7. >9.88 (>4.00)	10.00	6.71	100	10.00
Total	148.88	100.00	100	2.36

TABLE 24: DISTRIBUTION OF THOTTAM OPERATIONAL HOUSING AMONG THOTTAM OPERATOR HOUSEHOLDS, BY SIZE CATEGORY OF THOTTAM OPERATIONAL HOLDING

Size Class of Thottam Operational Holding	Number of Thottam Operator Households	(2) As Percent of Column Total	Thottam Area Owned And Operated With Family And/Or Hired Labour: Extent	(4) As Percent of Column Total	(4) As Percent of Row Total	Thottam Leased in: Extent	(7) As Percent of Column Total	(7) As Percent of Row Total
Acres (Hectares)			Acres			Acres		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2. 0-0.62 (0-0.25)	5	6.25	1.05	0.83	36.59	0.62	1.30	21.60
3. 0.62-1.24 (0.25-0.50)	17	21.25	10.18	8.05	59.60	6.90	14.50	40.40
4. 1.24-2.47 (0.50-1.00)	35	43.75	39.28	31.06	62.37	17.30	36.36	27.47
5. 2.47-4.94 (1.00-2.00)	15	18.75	22.58	17.85	47.90	19.76	41.53	41.92
6. 4.94-9.88 (2.00-4.00)	7	8.75	43.37	34.30	88.38	3.00	6.31	6.12
7. >9.88 (>4.00)	1	1.25	10.00	7.91	100.00	0	0	0
Total	80	100.00	126.46	100.00	66.86	47.58	100.00	25.16

TABLE 24: (contd)

Size Class of Thottam Operational Holding	Thottam Mortgaged in			Total Area of Thottam Operational Holding			Average Size of Household Thottam operational Holding
	Extent	(10) As Percent of Column Total	(10) As Percent of Row Total	Extent	(13) As Percent of Column Total	(13) As Percent of Row Total	
Acres (Hectares)	Acres			Acres			Acres
1	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
2. 0-0.62 (0-0.25)	1.20	7.91	41.81	2.87	1.52	100	0.57
3. 0.62-1.24 (0.25-0.50)	0	0	0	17.08	9.03	100	1.00
4. 1.24-2.47 (0.50-1.00)	6.40	42.38	10.16	62.98	33.30	100	1.80
5. 2.47-4.94 (1.00-2.00)	4.80	31.79	10.18	47.14	24.92	100	3.14
6. 4.94-9.88 (2.00-4.00)	2.70	17.88	5.50	49.07	25.94	100	7.01
7. >9.88 (>4.00)	0	0	0	10.00	5.29	100	10.00
Total	15.10	100.00	7.98	189.14	100.00	100	2.36

TABLE 25: DISTRIBUTION OF OPERATIONAL HOLDINGS BY SIZE CLASS OF OPERATIONAL HOLDING, GOKILAPURAM REVENUE VILLAGE; FROM WORLD AGRICULTURAL CENSUS, TAMILNADU, 1970-71

Size Class of Operational Holding		Operational Holdings		Area of Operational Holdings			Average size of Operational Holding	
				Extent				
In Hectares	In Acres	Number	(3) As percent of Column Total	In Hectares	In Acres	(5) & (6) As Percent of Column Total	In Hectares	In Acres
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. 0-0.50	0-1.24	183	53.04	45.08	111.35	11.77	0.246	0.61
2. 0.50-1.00	1.24-2.47	75	21.74	52.89	130.64	13.81	0.705	1.74
3. 1.00-2.00	2.47-4.94	41	11.88	59.19	146.20	15.46	1.444	3.57
4. 2.00-3.00	4.94-7.41	22	6.38	53.87	133.06	14.07	2.449	6.05
5. 3.00-4.00	7.41-9.88	10	2.90	35.41	87.46	9.25	3.541	8.75
6. 4.00-5.00	9.88-12.35	3	0.87	13.61	33.62	3.56	4.537	11.21
7. 5.00-10.00	12.35-24.79	5	1.45	32.52	80.32	8.49	6.504	16.06
8. 10.00-20.00	24.70-49.40	5	1.45	60.82	150.22	15.89	12.164	30.04
9. 20.00-30.00	49.40-74.10	1	0.29	29.48	72.82	7.70	29.480	72.82
Total		345	100	382.87	945.69	100	1.110	2.74

TABLE 26: DISTRIBUTION OF OWNERSHIP HOLDINGS AMONG HOUSEHOLDS, BY ECONOMIC CLASSIFICATION (in acres)

Group	Number of Households in Group	Owned & Operated with Family And/ Or Hired Labour (TOTAL HOLDINGS)	Leased Out	Mortgaged Out	Ownership Holding	Number of Owner-Households
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Major Landlords	11 1.69	227.70 34.82 (98.20)	4.18 4.56 (1.80)	0	231.88 29.42 (100)	11 5.42
2. Medium Landlords	10 1.54	58.80 8.99 (85.93)	5.87 6.40 (8.58)	3.76 8.84 (5.49)	68.43 8.68 (100)	10 4.92
3. Non Labouring Small Landholders	11 1.69	31.14 4.76 (77.60)	5.58 6.08 (13.90)	3.41 8.02 (8.50)	40.13 5.09 (100)	11 5.42
4. PEASANTS						
1) 1 >0 ≤0.249	23 3.54	108.13 16.53 (95.71)	4.25 4.63 (3.76)	0.60 1.41 (0.53)	112.98 14.33 (100)	23 11.33
2) 1= 0.250-0.749	19 2.92	40.28 6.16 (86.10)	6.10 6.65 (13.04)	0.40 0.94 (0.86)	46.78 5.93 (100)	14 6.90
3) 1= 0.750-1.249	8 1.23	2.09 0.32 (24.62)	2.40 2.62 (28.27)	4.00 9.40 (47.11)	8.49 1.08 (100)	5 2.46
4) 1= 1.250-1.999	16 2.46	21.54 3.29 (78.21)	4.20 4.58 (15.25)	1.80 4.23 (6.54)	27.54 3.49 (100)	10 4.93
5) 1= 2.000-4.999	26 4.00	15.49 2.37 (96.87)	0 -	0.50 1.17 (3.13)	15.99 2.03 (100)	12 5.91
6) 1≥5.000	12 1.85	13.86 2.12 (77.21)	2.09 2.28 (11.64)	2.00 4.70 (11.15)	17.95 2.28 (100)	8 3.94

TABLE 26: (contd)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS						
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings						
a) Owning & Operating	30 4.62	68.46 10.47 (90.88)	3.60 3.93 (4.78)	3.27 7.69 (4.34)	75.33 9.56 (100)	30 14.78
b) Operating, Not Owning	17 2.62	-	-	-	0	0
c) Owning, Not Operating	14 2.15	0	18.55 20.22 (75.10)	6.15 14.46 (24.90)	24.70 3.13 (100)	14 6.90
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	257 39.54	-	-	-	0	0
6. NON AGRICULTURAL LABOUR						
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	8 1.23	1.47 0.23 (19.68)	1.50 1.64 (20.08)	4.50 10.58 (60.24)	7.47 0.95 (100)	6 2.96
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	21 3.23	-	-	-	0	0
7. WITH MAJOR INCOME FROM BUSINESS ACTIVITY OTHER THAN AGRICULTURE						
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	23 3.54	24.65 3.71 (65.13)	7.95 8.67 (21.00)	5.25 12.34 (13.87)	37.85 4.80 (100)	17 8.37
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	57 8.77	-	-	-	0	0

TABLE 26: (contd)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. MAJOR INCOME FROM ARTISAN ACTIVITY, FROM WORK AT TRADITIONAL CASTE CALLING						
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	13 2.00	16.50 2.52 (54.28)	10.90 11.88 (35.85)	3.00 7.05 (9.87)	30.40 3.86 (100)	12 5.91
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	23 3.54	-	-	-	0	0
9. SALARIED PERSONS, (NON MANUAL LABOUR), PROFESSIONALS						
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	9 1.38	9.56 1.46 (51.65)	7.45 8.12 (40.25)	1.50 3.53 (8.10)	18.51 2.35 (100)	9 4.43
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	24 3.69	-	-	-	0	0
10. SMALL RENT INCOMES, REMITTANCES, OAP, INTEREST, ETC.						
1) With Ownership Holdings	5 0.77	0	7.10 7.74 (85.54)	1.20 2.82 (14.46)	8.30 1.05 (100)	5 2.46
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	6 0.92	-	-	-	0	0
11. Unclassified	7 1.08	14.35 2.19 (92.28)	0	1.20 2.82 (7.72)	15.55 1.97 (100)	6 2.96
Total	650 100	654.02 100 (82.97)	91.72 100 (11.63)	42.54 100 (5.40)	788.28 100 (100)	203 100

TABLE 26: (contd)

Group	NANJAI Owned and Operated with Family And/Or Hired Labour	Leased out	Mortgaged out	Ownership Holding	Number of Owner-Households
1	8	9	10	11	12
1. Major Landlords	104.79 66.72	0.50 5.14	0	105.29 60.17	10 12.99
2. Medium Landlords	9.84 6.26	0.30 3.08	2.56 31.26	12.70 7.26	8 10.39
3. Non Labouring Small Landholders	10.92 6.95	3.58 36.79	3.41 41.64	17.91 10.23	10 12.98
4. PEASANTS					
1) 1 > 0 ≤ 0.249	18.60 11.84	0	0	18.60 10.63	15 19.48
2) 1= 0.250-0-749	1.45 0.82	0	0.40 4.88	1.85 1.06	3 3.90
3) 1= 0.750-1.249	1.04 0.66	0	0	1.04 0.59	3 3.90
4) 1= 1.250-1.999	0.56 0.36	0	0	0.56 0.32	2 2.60
5) 1= 2.000-4.999	0.40 0.26	0	0	0.40 0.23	1 1.30
6) 1 ≥ 5.000	1.46 0.93	0	0	1.46 0.84	4 5.19

TABLE 26: (contd)

1	8	9	10	11	12
5. AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings					
a) Owning & Operating	0	0	0.62 7.57	0.62 0.35	2 2.60
b) Operating, Not Owning	-	[illegible]	-	0	0
c) Owning, Not Operating	0	0.20 2.06	0	0.20 0.12	2 2.60
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
6. NON AGRICULTURAL LABOUR					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	0.47 0.30	0	0	0.47 0.27	2 2.60
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
7. WITH MAJOR INCOME FROM BUSINESS ACTIVITY OTHER THAN AGRICULTURE					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	1.00 0.64	1.65 16.96	0	2.65 1.51	3 3.90
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0

TABLE 26: (contd)

1	8	9	10	11	12
8. MAJOR INCOME FROM ARTISAN ACTIVITY, FROM WORK AT TRADITIONAL CASTE CALLING					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	0.60 0.38	0.60 6.17	0	1.20 0.69	2 2.60
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
9. SALARIED PERSONS, (NON MANUAL LABOUR), PROFESSIONALS					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	5.06 3.22	0	0	5.06 2.89	4 5.19
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
10. SMALL RENT INCOMES, REMITTANCES, OAP, INTEREST, ETC.					
1) With Ownership Holdings	0	2.90 29.80	1.20 14.65	4.10 2.34	4 5.19
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
11. Unclassified	0.88 0.56	0	0	0.88 0.50	2 2.60
Total	157.07 100 (89.76)	9.73 100 (5.56)	8.19 100 (4.68)	174.99 100 (100)	77 100

TABLE 26: (contd)

	PUNJAB				
	Owned and Operated with Family And/Or Hired Labour	Leased out	Mortgaged out	Ownership Holding	Number of Owner-Households
1	13	14	15	16	17
1. Major Landlords	77.40 20.89	0	0	77.40 16.67	9 5.46
2. Medium Landlords	25.05 6.76	3.57 5.79	1.20 3.72	29.82 6.42	10 6.06
3. Non Labouring Small Landholders	15.70 4.24	2.00 3.24	0	17.70 3.81	8 4.85
4. PEASANTS					
1) 1 > 0 ≤ 0.249	75.12 20.28	2.10 3.41	0.60 1.86	77.82 16.76	22 13.33
2) 1= 0.250-0.749	20.60 5.56	3.30 5.35	0	23.90 5.15	9 5.45
3) 1= 0.750-1.249	0.60 0.16	2.40 3.89	4.00 12.40	7.00 1.51	3 1.82
4) 1= 1.250-1.999	17.38 4.69	4.20 6.81	1.80 5.58	23.38 5.03	8 4.85
5) 1= 2.000-4.999	12.99 3.51	0	0,50 1.55	13.49 2.90	9 5.45
6) 1 ≥ 5.000	9.70 2.62	1.00 1.62	2.00 6.20	12.70 2.73	6 3.64

TABLE 26: (contd)

1	13	14	15	16	17
5. AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings					
a) Owning & Operating	65.30 17.62	3.60 5.84	2.65 8.22	71.55 15.41	30 18.18
b) Operating, Not Owning	-	-	-	0	0
c) Owning, Not Operating	0	14.95 24.24	6.15 19.07	21.10 4.54	13 7.88
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
6. NON AGRICULTURAL LABOUR					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	1.00 0.27	0.90 1.46	4.50 13.96	6.40 1.38	3 1.82
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
7. WITH MAJOR INCOME FROM BUSINESS ACTIVITY OTHER THAN AGRICULTURE					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	22.40 6.05	6.30 10.22	5.25 16.28	33.95 7.31	15 9.09
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0

TABLE 26: (contd)

8:	MAJOR INCOME FROM ARTISAN ACTIVITY, FROM WORK AT TRADITIONAL CASTE CALLING					
1)	With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	13.35 3.60	8.50 13.78	2.10 6.51	23.95 5.16	12 7.27
2)	With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
9.	SALARIED PERSONS (NON MANUAL LABOUR), PROFESSIONALS					
1)	With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	2.10 0.57	4.65 7.54	1.50 4.65	8.25 1.78	5 3.03
2)	With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
10.	SMALL RENT INCOMES, REMITTANCES, OAP, INTEREST, ETC.					
1)	With Ownership Holdings	0	4.20 6.81	0	4.20 0.90	1 0.61
2)	With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
11.	Unclassified	11.80 3.18	0	0	11.80 2.54	2 1.21
	Total	370.49 100 (79.78)	61.67 100 (13.28)	32.25 100 (6.94)	464.41 100 (100)	165 100

TABLE 26: (contd)

	THOTTAM				
	Owned and Operated with Family And/Or Hired Labour	Leased out	Mortgaged out	Ownership Holding	Number of Owner-Households
1	18	19	20	21	22
1. Major Landlords	45.51 35.99	3.68 18.11	0	49.19 33.04	11 17.19
2. Medium Landlords	23.91 18.91	2.00 9.84	0	25.91 17.40	8 12.50
3. Non Labouring Small Landholders	4.52 3.57	0	0	4.52 3.04	3 4.69
4. PEASANTS					
1) 1> 0 ≤ 0.249	14.41 11.39	2.15 10.58	0	16.56 11.12	7 10.94
2) 1= 0.250-0.749	18.23 14.41	2.80 13.78	0	21.03 14.13	12 18.75
3) 1= 0.750-1.249	0.45 0.36	0	0	0.45 0.30	1 1.56
4) 1= 1.250-1.999	3.60 2.85	0	0	3.60 2.42	3 4.69
5) 1= 2.000-4.999	2.10 1.66	1.00	0	2.10 1.41	3 4.69
6) 1≥ 5.000	2.70 2.13	1.09 5.37	0	3.79 2.55	2 3.12

TABLE 26: (contd)

1	18	19	20	21	22
5. AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings					
a) Owning & Operating	3.16 2.50	0	0	3.16 2.12	2 3.12
b) Operating, Not Owning	-	-	-	0	0
c) Owning, Not Operating	0	3.40 16.73	0	3.40 2.28	2 3.12
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
6. NON AGRICULTURAL LABOUR					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	0	0.60 2.95	0	0.60 0.40	1 1.56
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
7. WITH MAJOR INCOME FROM BUSINESS ACTIVITY OTHER THAN AGRICULTURE					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	1.25 0.99	0	0	1.25 0.84	1 1.56
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0

TABLE 26: (contd)

1	18	19	20	21	22
8. MAJOR INCOME FROM ARTISAN ACTIVITY, FROM WORK AT TRADITIONAL CASTE CALLING					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	2.55 2.02	1.80 8.86	0.90 42.85	5.25 3.53	2 3.12
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
9. SALARIED PERSONS (NON MANUAL LABOUR), PROFESSIONALS					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	2.40 1.90	2.80 13.78	0	5.20 3.49	3 4.69
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
10. SMALL RENT INCOMES, REMITTANCES, OAP, INTEREST, ETC.					
1) With Ownership Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
11. Unclassified	1.67 1.32	0	1.20 57.15	2.87 1.93	3 4.69
Total	126.46 100 (84.94)	20.32 100 (13.65)	2.10 100 (1.41)	148.88 100 (100)	64 100

NOTE: Figures outside brackets in lower line are percentages to column totals; figures in brackets indicate the percentage of land under each tenurial type to total holdings.

TABLE 27: **DISTRIBUTION OF OPERATIONAL HOLDINGS AMONG HOUSEHOLDS, BY ECONOMIC CLASSIFICATION** (in acres)

	Group	Number of House-holds in Group	TOTAL HOLDINGS: Owned & Operated with Family And/Or Hired Labour	Leased in	Mortgaged in	Operational Holding	Number of Operator - Households
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Major Landords	11 1.69	227.70 34.79 (99.02)	2.25 1.53 (0.98)	0	229.95 27.14 (100)	11 4.82
2.	~~Medium Landlord~~						
2.	Medium Landlords	10 1.54	58.80 8.98 (94.23)	3.60 2.44 (5.77)	0	62.40 7.37 (100)	10 4.39
3.	Non Labouring Small LandHolders	11 1.69	31.14 4.76 (95.84)	1.35 0.92 (4.16)	0	32.49 3.83 (100)	11 4.82
4.	PEASANTS						
1)	1 > 0≤0.249	23 3.54	108.13 16.52 (83.55)	16.04 10.88 (12.39)	5.25 11.57 (4.06)	129.42 15.28 (100)	23 10.09
2)	1 = 0.250-0.749	19 2.92	40.28 6.16 (69.86)	15.58 10.57 (27.02)	1.80 3.97 (3.12)	57.66 6.81 (100)	19 8.33
3)	1 = 0.750-1.249	8 1.23	2.09 0.32 (12.75)	8.00 5.43 (48.81)	6.30 13.89 (38.44)	16.39 1.93 (100)	8 3.51
4)	1 = 1.250-1.999	16 2.46	21.54 3.29 (42.97)	27.59 18.72 (55.04)	1.00 2.20 (1.99)	50.13 5.92 (100)	16 7.02
5)	1 = 2.000-4.999	26 4.00	15.49 2.37 (31.33)	24.90 16.89 (50.36)	9.05 19.95 (18.31)	49.44 5.83 (100)	26 11.41
6)	1 ≥ 5.000	12 1.85	14.26 2.18 (50.25)	11.42 7.75 (40.24)	2.70 5.95 (9.51)	28.38 3.35 (100)	12 5.26

TABLE 27: (contd)

1		2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS						
1)	With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings						
a)	Owning & Operating	30 4.62	68.46 10.46 (91.02)	0.45 0.30 (0.60)	6.30 13.89 (8.38)	75.21 8.88 (100)	30 [illegible] 13.16
b)	Operating, Not owning	17 2.62	0	26.49 17.97 (89.83)	3.00 6.62 (10.17)	29.49 3.48 (100)	17 7.46
c)	Owning, Not Operating	14 2.15	-	-	-	0	0
2)	With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	257 39.54	-	-	-	0	0
6.	NON AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS						
1)	With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	8 1.23	1.47 0.22 (27.68)	0	3.84 8.47 (72.32)	5.31 0.63 (100)	6 3.63
2)	With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	21 3.23	-	-	-	0	0
7.	WITH MAJOR INCOME FROM BUSINESS ACTIVITY OTHER THAN AGRICULTURE						
1)	With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	23 3.54	24.65 3.77 (65.21)	8.53 5.79 (22.57)	4.62 10.19 (12.22)	37.80 4.46 (100)	19 8.33
2)	With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	57 8.77	-	-	-	0	0

TABLE 27: (contd)

1		2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	<u>MAJOR INCOME FROM ARTISAN ACTIVITY, FROM WORK AT TRADITIONAL CASTE CALLING</u>						
1)	With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	13 2.00	16.50 2.52 (95.65)	0	0.75 1.65 (4.35)	17.25 2.04 (100)	8 3.51
2)	With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	23 3.54	-	-	-	0	0
9.	<u>SALARIED PERSONS (NON MANUAL LABOUR), PROFESSIONALS</u>						
1)	With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	9 1.38	9.56 1.46 (92.73)	0	0.75 1.65 (7.27)	10.31 1.22 (100)	6 2.63
2)	With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	24 3.69	-	-	-	0	0
10.	<u>SMALL RENT INCOMES, REMITTANCES, OAP, INTEREST, ETC.</u>						
1)	With Ownership Holdings	5 0.77	-	-	-	0	0
2)	With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	6 0.92	-	-	-	0	0
11.	Unclassified	7 1.08	14.35 2.19 (92.28)	1.20 0.81 (7.72)	0	15.55 1.83 (100)	6 2.63
	Total	650 100	654.42 100 (77.25)	147.40 100 (17.40)	45.36 100 (5.35)	847.18 100 (100)	228 100

TABLE 27: (contd)

	Owned & Operated with Family and/ Or Hired Labour	N A N J A I Leased in	Mortgaged in	Operational Holding	Number of Operator Households
1	8	9	10	11	12
1. Major Landlords	104.79 66.54 (97.90)	2.25 5.09 (2.10)	0	107.04 52.94 (100)	11 10.48
2. Medium Landlords	9.84 6.25 (94.25)	0.60 1.35 (5.75)	0	10.44 5.16 (100)	8 7.62
3. Non Labouring Small Land Holders	10.92 6.93 (89.00)	1.35 3.06 (11.00)	0	12.27 6.07 (100)	10 9.53
4. PEASANTS					
1) 1 >0 ≤0.249	18.60 11.81 (57.69)	13.64 30.88 (42.31)	0	32.24 15.94 (100)	22 20.95
2) 1= 0.250-0.749	1.45 0.92 (27.51)	3.82 8.65 (72.49)	0	5.27 2.61 (100)	5 4.76
3) 1= 0.750-1.249	1.04 0.66 (46.43)	1.20 2.72 (53.57)	0	2.24 1.11 (100)	4 3.81
4) 1= 1.250-1.999	0.56 0.36 (8.78)	5.82 13.18 (91.22)	0	6.38 3.15 (100)	7 6.67
5) 1= 2.000-4.999	0.40 0.26 (4.06)	9.00 20.38 (91.37)	0.45 78.95 (4.57)	9.85 4.87 (100)	15 14.29
6) 1 ≥ 5.000	1.86 1.18 (72.09)	0.72 1.63 (27.91)	0	2.58 1.28 (100)	7 6.67

TABLE 27: (contd)

	8	9	10	11	12
5. AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings					
a) Owning & Operating	0	0.45 1.02 (100)	0	0.45 0.22 (100)	1 0.95
b) Operating, Not Owning	0	0.19 0.43 (100)	0	0.19 0.09 (100)	1 0.95
c) Owning, Not Operating	-	-	-	0	0
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
6. NON AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	0.47 0.30 (100)	0	0	0.47 0.23 (100)	2 1.90
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
7. WITH MAJOR INCOME FROM BUSINESS ACTIVITY OTHER THAN AGRICULTURE					
1) With Owner ship And/Or Operational Holdings	1.00 0.64 (16.00)	5.13 11.61 (82.08)	0.12 21.05 (1.92)	6.25 3.09 (100)	5 4.76
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0

TABLE 27: (contd)

1	8	9	10	11	12
8. MAJOR INCOME FROM ARTISAN ACTIVITY, FROM WORK AT TRADITIONAL CASTE CALLING					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	0.60 0.38 (100)	0	0	0.60 0.30 (100)	1 0.95
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
9. SALARIED PERSONS (NON MANUAL LABOUR), PROFESSIONALS					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	5.06 3.21 (100)	0	0	5.06 2.50 (100)	4 3.81
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
10. SMALL RENT INCOMES, REMITTANCES, OAP, INTEREST, ETC.					
1) With Ownership Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
11. Unclassified	0.88 0.56 (100)	0	0	0.88 0.44 (100)	2 1.90
Total	157.47 100 (77.87)	44.17 100 (21.85)	0.57 100 (0.28)	202.21 100 (100)	105 100

TA LE 27: (contd)

Group	Owned & Operated with Family And/ Or Hired Labour	Leased in	Mortgaged in	Operational Holding	Number of Operator-Households
	PUNJAB				
1	13	14	15	16	17
1. Major Landlords	77.40 20.89 (100)	0	0	77.40 16.98 (100)	9 5.52
2. Medium Landlords	25.05 6.76 (89.30)	3.00 5.39 (10.70)	0	28.05 6.15 (100)	8 4.91
3. Non Labouring Small Land Holders	15.70 4.24 (100)	0	0	15.70 3.44 (100)	7 4.29
4. PEASANTS					
1) 1>0≤0.249	75.12 20.28 (94.17)	2.40 4.32 (3.01)	2.25 7.58 (2.82)	79.77 17.50 (100)	22 13.50
2) 1= 0.250-0.749	20.60 5.56 (91.96)	1.80 3.23 (8.04)	0	22.40 4.91 (100)	7 4.29
3) 1= 0.750-1.249	0.60 0.16 (11.76)	1.80 3.23 (35.29)	2.70 9.09 (52.94)	5.10 1.12 (100)	3 1.84
4) 1= 1.250-1.999	17.38 4.69 (66.26)	8.85 15.90 (33.74)	0	26.23 5.75 (100)	10 6.14
5) 1= 2.000-4.999	12.99 3.51 (61.89)	1.20 2.16 (5.72)	6.80 22.90 (32.39)	20.99 4.61 (100)	12 7.36
6) 1 ≥ 5.000	9.70 2.62 (62.99)	5.70 10.24 (37.01)	0	15.40 3.38 (100)	7 4.29

TABLE 27: (contd)

1	13	14	15	16	17
5. AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings					
a) Owning & Operating	65.30 17.62 (91.97)	0	5.70 19.20 (8.03)	71.00 15.58 (100)	30 18.41
b) Operating, Not Owning	0	26.30 47.26 (89.76)	3.00 10.10 (10.24)	29.30 6.43 (100)	16 9.82
c) Owning, Not Operating	-	-	- -	0	0
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operationsl Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
6. NON AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	1.00 0.27 (23.58)	0	3.24 10.91 (76.42)	4.24 0.93 (100)	3 1.84
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
7. WITH MAJOR INCOME FROM BUSINESS ACTIVITY OTHER THAN AGRICULTURE					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	22.40 6.05 (73.93)	3.40 6.11 (11.22)	4.50 15.16 (14.85)	30.30 6.65 (100)	15 9.20
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0

TABLE 27: (contd)

1	13	14	15	16	17
8. MAJOR INCOME FROM ARTISAN ACTIVITY, FROM WORK AT TRADITIONAL CASTE CALLING					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	13.35 3.60 (94.68)	0	0.75 2.53 (5.32)	14.10 3.09 (100)	8 4.91
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
9. SALARIED PERSONS (NON MANUAL LABOUR), PROFESSIONALS					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	2.10 0.57 (73.68)	0	0.75 2.53 (26.32)	2.85 0.63 (100)	3 1.84
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
10. SMALL RENT INCOMES, REMITTANCES, OAP, INTEREST, ETC.					
1) With Ownership Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
11. Unclassified	11.80 3.18 (90.77)	1.20 2.16 (9.23)	0	13.00 2.85 (100)	3 1.84
Total	370.49 100 (81.28)	55.65 100 (12.21)	29.69 100 (6.51)	455.83 100 (100)	163 100

TABLE 27: (contd)

Group	THOTTAM Owned & Operated with Family and/ Or Hired Labour	Leased in	Mortgaged in	Operational Holding	Number of Operator Households
1	18	19	20	21	22
1. Major Landlords	45.51 85.99 (100)	0	0	45.51 24.06 (100)	10 11.90
2. Medium Landlords	23.91 18.91 (100)	0	0	23.91 12.64 (100)	8 9.53
3. Non Labouring Small Land Holders	4.52 3.57 (100)	0	0	4.52 2.39 (100)	3 3.57
4. PEASANTS					
1) 1>0<0.249	14.41 11.39 (82.77)	0	3.00 19.87 (17.23)	17.41 9.20 (100)	6 7.14
2) 1= 0.250-0.749	18.23 14.41 (60.79)	9.96 20.93 (33.21)	1.80 11.92 (6.00)	29.99 15.86 (100)	16 19.05
3) 1= 0.750-1.249	0.45 0.36 (4.97)	5.00 10.51 (55.25)	3.60 23.84 (39.78)	9.05 4.78 (100)	5 5.95
4) 1= 1.250-1.999	3.60 2.85 (20.55)	12.92 27.15 (73.74)	1.00 6.63 (5.71)	17.52 9.26 (100)	10 11.91
5) 1= 2.000-4.999	2.10 1.66 (11.29)	14.70 30.90 (79.03)	1.80 11.92 (9.68)	18.60 9.83 (100)	11 13.10
6) 1 ≥ 5.000	2.70 2.13 (25.96)	5.00 10.51 (48.08)	2.70 17.88 (25.96)	10.40 5.50 (100)	6 7.14

TABLE 27: (contd)

1	18	19	20	21	22
5. AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings					
a) Owning & Operating	3.16 2.50 (84.04)	0	0.60 3.97 (15.96)	3.76 1.99 (100)	3 3.57
b) Operating, Not Owning	-	-	-	0	0
c) Owning, Not Operating	-	-	-	0	0
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
6. NON AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	0	0	0.60 3.97 (100)	0.60 0.32 (100)	1 1.19
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
7. WITH MAJOR INCOME FROM BUSINESS ACTIVITY OTHER THAN AGRICULTURE					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	1.25 0.99 (100)	0	0	1.25 0.66	1 1.19
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0

TABLE 27: (contd)

1	18	19	20	21	22
8. MAJOR INCOME FROM ARTISAN ACTIVITY, FROM WORK AT TRADITIONAL CASTE CALLING					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	2.55 2.02 (100)	0	[illegible] [illegible] ([illegible])	2.55 1.35 (100)	2 2.38
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
9. SALARIED PERSONS (NON MANUAL LABOUR), PROFESSIONALS					
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	2.40 1.90 (100)	0	[illegible] [illegible] ([illegible])	2.40 1.27 (100)	1 1.19
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
10. SMALL RENT INCOMES, REMITTANCES, OAP, INTEREST, ETC.					
1) With Ownership Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
2) With Neither Ownership Nor Operational Holdings	-	-	-	0	0
11. Unclassified	1.67 1.32 (100)	0	0	1.67 0.88 (100)	1 1.19
Total	126.46 100 (66.86)	47.58 100 (25.16)	15.10 100 (7.98)	189.14 100 (100)	84 100

NOTE: Figures out of brackets in the lower lines are percentages of column totals; figures in brackets indicate the percentage of area under each tenurial type to total area of holding.

TABLE 28: AVERAGE SIZE OF HOLDINGS, BY ECONOMIC CLASSIFICATION (IN ACRES)

	All Holdings		Nanjai		Punjai		Thottam	
	Ownership	Operational	Ownership	Operational	Ownership	Operational	Ownership	Operational
1. Major Landlords	21.08	20.90	10.53	9.73	8.60	8.60	4.47	4.55
2. Medium Landlords	6.84	6.24	8.55	1.31	2.98	3.51	3.24	2.99
3. Non Labouring Small Landowners	3.65	2.95	1.79	1.23	2.21	2.24	1.51	1.51
4. Peasantry								
1) 1>0 ≤ 0.249	4.91	5.27	1.24	1.46	3.54	3.63	2.37	2.90
2) 0.250-0.749	3.34	3.03	0.62	1.05	2.66	3.20	1.75	1.87
3) 0.750-1.249	1.70	2.05	0.35	0.56	2.33	1.70	0.45	1.81
4) 1.250-1.999	2.75	3.13	0.28	0.91	2.92	2.62	1.20	1.75
5) 2.000-4.999	1.33	1.90	0.40	0.66	1.50	1.75	0.70	1.69
6) 1 ≥5.000	2.24	2.37	0.37	0.37	2.12	2.20	1.90	1.73
5. Agricultural Labourers								
1a With ownership and Operational Holdings	2.51	2.51	0.31	0.45	2.39	2.37	1.58	1.25
1b With Operational, But no Own Holdings	0	1.73	0	0.19	0	1.83	0	0
1c With Ownership, But no Operational Holdings	1.76	0	0.10	0	1.62	0	1.70	0
2) With Neither Own Nor Operational Holdings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Non Agricultural Labourers								
1) With Ownership And/Or Operational Holdings	1.25	0.89	0.24	0.24	2.13	1.41	0.60	0.60
2) With Neither Own Nor Operational Holdings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 28: (contd.) AVERAGE SIZE OF HOLDINGS, BY ECONOMIC CLASSFICATION (IN ACRES)

	All Holdings		Nanjai		Punjai		Thottam	
	Ownership	Operational	Ownership	Operational	Ownership	Operational	Ownership	Operational
7. Main Income From Business Activity Other Than Agriculture								
1) With Own And/Or Operational Holdings	2.23	1.99	0.88	1.25	2.26	2.02	1.25	1.25
2) With Neither Own Nor Operational Holdings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. Main Earnings from Artisanal Activity, Work at Tradl-Caste Calling								
1) With Own And/Or Operational Holding	2.53	2.16	0.60	0.60	2.00	1.76	2.63	1.28
2) With Neither Own Nor Operational Holding	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Main Earnings From Salaried Persons, Professionals, Etc.								
1) With Own And/Or Operational Holding	2.06	1.72	1.27	1.27	1.65	0.95	1.73	2.40
2) With Neither Own Nor Operational Holding	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Main Income From Small Rent, Remittances, OAP Etc.								
1) With Own And/Or Operational Holding	1.66	0	1.03	0	4.20	0	0	0
2) With Neither Own Nor Operational Holding	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. Unclassified	2.59	2.59	0.44	0.44	5.90	4.33	0.96	1.67
Total	3.88	3.72	2.27	1.93	2.81	2.80	2.33	2.25

Note: The figures are the total holdings in a group divided by the actual number of owners and operators in the group.

TABLE 29: PERCENTAGE SHARE OF NANJAI, PUNJAI AND THOTTAM IN THE TOTAL OWNERSHIP AND OPERATIONAL HOLDINGS OF EACH CLASS (in %)

		OWNERSHIP				OPERATIONAL			
		Nanjai	Punjai	Thottam	Total Ownership	Nanjai	Punjai	Thottam	Total Operational
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.	Major Landlords	45.41	33.38	21.21	100	46.55	33.66	19.79	100
2.	Medium Landlords	18.56	43.58	37.86	100	16.73	44.95	38.32	100
3.	Non-Labouring Small Landholders	44.63	44.11	11.26	100	37.773	48.32	13.91	100
4.	Peasantry								
1)	1 > 0.0 ≤ 0.249	16.46	68.88	14.66	100	24.91	61.64	13.45	100
2)	0.250-0.749	3.95	51.09	44.96	100	9.14	38.85	52.01	100
3)	0.750-1.249	12.25	82.45	5.30	100	13.67	31.11	55.22	100
4)	1.250-1.999	2.03	84.90	13.07	100	12.73	52.32	34.95	100
5)	2.000-4.999	2.50	84.37	13.13	100	19.92	42.46	37.62	100
6)	1≥5.000	8.13	70.75	21.12	100	9.09	54.26	36.15	100
5.	Agricultural Labourers								
1)a	With Own and Operational Holdings	0.82	94.98	4.20	100	0.60	94.40	5.00	100
1)b	With Operational, But no Own Holdings	0				0.64	99.36	0	100
1)c	With Ownership, But No Operational Holdings	0.81	85.42	13.77	100				
2)	With Neither Own Nor Operational Holdings	0							
6.	Non Agricultural Labourers								
1)	With Own And/Or Operational Holdings	6.29	85.68	8.03	100	8.85	79.85	11.30	100
2)	With Neither Own Nor Operational Holdings								

TABLE 29: (contd)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7.	Main Income from Business Activity Other than Agriculture								
1)	With Own And/Or Operational Holdings	7.00	89.70	3.30	100	16.53	80.16	3.31	100
2)	With Neither Own Nor Operational Holdings								
8.	Main Earnings from Artisanal Activity, Work at Traditional Caste Calling								
1)	With Own And/Or Operational Holdings	3.95	78.78	17.27	100	3.48	8.74	14.78	100
2)	With Neither Own, Nor Operational Holding								
9.	Main Earnings from Salaried Persons, Professionals, etc.								
1)	With Own And/Or Operational Holding	27.34	44.57	28.09	100	49.08	27.64	23.28	100
2)	With Neither Own Nor Operational Holding								
10.	Main Income from Small Rents, Remittances, OAP, etc								
1)	With Own And/Or Operational Holding	49.40	50.60	0	100				
2)	With Neither Own Nor Operational Holding								
11.	Unclassified	5.66	75.88	18.46	100	5.66	83.60	10.78	100
	Total	22.20	58.91	18.89	100	23.87	53.81	22.32	100

TABLE 38: ASSETS OF HOUSEHOLDS, BY SIZE CATEGORY OF OWNERSHIP HOLDING

(in rupees)

Size Category of Ownership Holding Hectares (Acres)	Crop Land	Percent i	Percent ii	Other Agricultural Assets	Percent i	Percent ii	Draught Animals	Percent i	Percent ii	Other Livestock	Percent i	Percent ii
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1(A) 0	0	0	0	2273 (39.19)	0.51	0.63	33850 (583.62)	26.21	9.35	19899 (348.09)	11.48	5.50
1(B) 0	0	0	0	88 (<1)	0.02	0.02	6500 (24)	5.03	1.07	47598 (178)	27.45	7.81
1(C) 0	81463 (673)	0.72	10.32	0	0	0	1300 (11)	1.01	0.16	8752 (722)	5.05	1.11
2. 0-0.25 (0-0.62)	206917 (8996)	1.84	47.37	5779 (251)	1.29	1.32	3800 (165)	2.94	0.87	10019 (436)	5.78	2.30
3. 0.25-0.50 (0.62-1.24)	537550 (13783)	4.78	44.23	16818 (431)	3.76	1.38	7683 (197)	5.95	0.63	6067 (156)	3.50	0.50
4. 0.50-1.00 (1.24-2.47)	517917 (12331)	4.60	49.11	15268 (364)	3.42	1.45	4300 (102)	3.33	0.41	14638 (349)	8.44	1.39
5. 1.00-2.00 (2.47-4.94)	1449236 (29576)	12.88	63.56	25370 (518)	5.67	1.11	19600 (400)	15.18	0.86	14048 (287)	8.10	0.62
6. 2.00-4.00 (4.94-9.88)	2242515 (60090)	19.93 [illegible]	57.79 [illegible]	50632 (1808)	11.33	1.30	17700 (632)	13.71	0.46	13738 (491)	7.92	0.35
7. 4.00-6.00 (9.88-14.82)	863000 (143833)	7.67	60.73	23900 (3983)	5.35	1.68	8400 (1400)	6.51	0.59	9893 (1649)	5.71	0.70

TABLE 36 (contd)

1		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
8.	6.00-8.00 (14.82-19.76)	1490600 (298120)	13.25	58.06	12590 (2518)	2.82	0.49	14000 (2800)	10.84	0.55	9255 (1851)	5.34	0.36
9.	8.00-10.00 (19.76-24.70)												
10.	> 10.00 (> 24.70)	3862000 (772400)	34.33	61.97	294262 (58852)	65.83	4.72	12000 (2400)	9.29	0.19	19470 (3894)	11.23	0.31
	Total	11251198 (17498)	100	53.97	446980 (695)	100	2.14	129133 (201)	100	0.62	173377 (270)	100	0.83

NOTE :

1. Average asset holding per household in group is in brackets
2. Percent (i) are percentages to column totals;
   Percent (ii) are percentages to row totals.

TABLE 38: (contd)

Size Category of Ownership Holding Hectares (Acres)	Thope Land	Percent i	Percent ii	Plantation Land	Percent i	Percent ii	Non Agricultural Assets	Percent i	Percent ii	All Assets	Percent i	Percent ii	Number of Households	Percent i
1	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
1(A) 0	30650 (528.45)	1.99	8.47	0	0	0	275261 (4745.88)	4.59	76.05	361933 (6240.22)	1.74	100	58	9.02
1(B) 0	6788 (25)	0.44	1.11	4500 (17)	0.34	0.74	543631 (2036)	9.06	89.25	609105 (2281)	2.92	100	267	41.52
1)C) 0	5100 (42)	0.33	0.65	150500 (1244)	11.54	19.07	542056 (4480)	9.03	68.69	789171 (6522)	3.79	100	121	18.82
2. 0-0.25 (0-0.62)	13033 (567)	0.84	2.98	25000 (1087)	1.92	5.72	172304 (7491)	2.87	39.44	436852 (18994)	2.09	100	23	3.58
3. 0.25-0.50 (0.62-1.24)	32000 (821)	2.07	2.63	200000 (5128)	15.34	16.46	415192 (10646)	6.92	34.16	1215310 (31162)	5.83	100	39	6.07
4. 0.50-1.00 (1.24-2.47)	29272 (697)	1.90	2.78	25000 (595)	1.92	2.37	448197 (10671)	7.47	42.50	1054592 (25109)	5.06	100	42	6.53
5. 1.00-2.00 (2.47-4.94)	67733 (1382)	4.39	2.97	71500 (1459)	5.48	3.14	632509 (12908)	10.54	27.74	2279996 (46531)	10.94	100	49	7.62
6. 2.00-4.00 (4.94-9.88)	419325 (14976)	27.16	10.80	140000 (5000)	10.74	3.61	996785 (35599)	16.62	25.69	3880695 (138596)	18.61	100	28	4.35
7. 4.00-6.00	200000 (33333)	12.96	14.07	80000 (13333)	6.13	5.63	235839 (39307)	3.93	16.60	1421032 (236839)	6.82	100	6	0.93

TABLE 38: (contd)

	1	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
8.	6.00-8.00 (14.82-19.76)	338000 (67600)	21.89	13.17	119000 (23800)	9.13	4.63	583900 (116780)	9.73	22.74	2567345 (513469)	12.31	100	5	0.78
9.	8.00-10.00 (19.76-24.70)	-			-			-			-			0	-
10.	>10.00 (> 24.70)	401825 (80365)	26.03	6.45	488500 (9770)	37.46	7.84	1154480 (230896)	19.24	18.52	6232537 (1246507)	29.89	100	5	0.78
	Total	1543726 (2401)	100	7.40	1304000 (2028)	100	6.26	6000154 (9331)	100	28.78	20848568 (32423)	100	100	643	100

NOTE: 1. Average asset holding per household in group is in brackets

2. Percent (i) are percentages to column totals;
Percent (ii) are percentages to row totals.

TABLE 39: ASSETS OWNED BY HOUSEHOLDS, BY ECONOMIC CLASSIFICATION (in rupees)

	Number of Households in Group	Percent	Crop Land	Percent		Other Agricultural Assets	Percent		Draught Animals	Percent		Other Livestock	Percent	
		i		i	ii		i	ii		i	ii		i	ii
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Major Landlords	11	(1.69)	5959750	52.95	57.66	321134	71.84	3.11	27500	21.15	0.26	32460	18.72	0.30
2. Medium Landlords	10	(1.54)	304000	9.19	56.99	29712	6.65	1.64	14550	11.19	0.80	12685	7.31	0.70
3. Non-Labouring Small landowners	11	(1.69)	683800	6.07	59.45	6370	1.43	0.55	2200	1.69	0.19	4845	2.79	0.42
4. PEASANTS														
1) 1 >0 < 0.249	23	(3.54)	1269550	11.28	72.98	22298	4.99	1.28	13500	10.38	0.78	13679	7.89	0.79
2) 0.250-0.749	19	(2.92)	403217	3.58	60.33	29614	6.62	4.43	6900	5.31	1.03	5934	3.42	0.89
3) 0.750-1.249	8	(1.23)	74900	0.66	63.84	3983	0.89	3.39	2500	1.92	2.13	1069	0.62	0.91
4) 1.250-1.999	16	(2.46)	154992	1.38	46.23	4525	1.01	1.35	11300	8.69	3.37	5604	3.23	1.67
5) 2.000-4.999	26	(4.00)	99875	0.88	38.30	8412	1.88	3.23	14733	11.33	5.65	6138	3.54	2.35
6) 1 ≥ 5.000	12	(1.85)	119200	1.06	49.19	3194	0.71	1.32	3900	3.00	1.61	8552	4.93	3.53
5. AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS														
1)a Ownership & Operational	30	(4.62)	203585	1.81	55.21	333	0.07	0.09	10800	8.31	2.93	7907	4.56	2.15
1)b Operational, No Ownership	17	(2.62)	0	-	-	766	0.17	1.55	9700	7.46	19.65	958	0.55	1.94
1)c Ownership, No Operational	14	(2.15)	86967	0.77	68.06	30	0.01	0.02	0	-	-	454	0.26	0.36
2) Neither Own, Nor Operational	257	(39.54)	0	-	-	88	0.02	0.02	6500	5.00	1.15	46085	26.58	8.17
6. NON AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS														
1) Ownership &/Or Operational	8	(1.23)	13700	0.12	18.74	0	-	-	0	-	-	1120	0.65	1.53
2) Neither Own Nor Operational	21	(3.23)	2250	0.02	5.07	0	-	-	0	-	-	1522	0.88	3.43

TABLE 38: (contd)
TABLE 39: (contd)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
7.	MAIN INCOME FROM BUSINESS ACTIVITY OTHER THAN AGRICULTURE														
1)	Ownership &/Or Operational	23	(3.54)	221700	1.97	28.13	2774	0.62	0.35	3300	2.54	0.42	14019	8.09	1.78
2)	Neither Own Nor Operational	57	(8.77)	48000	0.43	9.05	0	-	-	800	0.61	0.15	6726	3.88	1.27
8.	ARTISANAL ACTIVITY, TRADITIONAL CALLING														
1)	Ownership &/Or Operational	13	(2.00)	167050	1.48	67.78	6500	1.46	2.64	450	0.35	0.18	470	0.27	0.19
2)	Neither Own Nor Operational	23	(3.54)	2000	0.02	3.69	0	-	-	0	-	-	1506	0.87	2.78
9.	SALARIED PERSONS, PROFESSIONALS														
1)	Ownership &/Or Operational	9	(1.38)	365384	3.25	63.39	4080	0.91	0.71	0	-	-	487	0.28	0.08
2)	Neither Own Nor Operational	24	(3.69)	19213	0.17	11.75	0	-	-	500	0.38	0.31	506	0.29	0.31
10.	SMALL RENT, REMITTANCE, OAP, ETC.														
1)	Ownership &/Or Operational	5	(0.77)	210000	1.87	57.88	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-
2)	Neither Own Nor Operational	6	(0.92)	10000	0.09	23.80	0	-	-	0	-	-	5	<0.01	0.01
11.	Unclassified	7	(1.08)	106500	0.95	51.73	3197	0.72	1.55	900	0.69	0.44	661	0.38	0.32
	Total	650	(100)	11256223	100	53.96	447010	100	2.14	130033	100	0.62	173392	100	0.83

TABLE 39: (contd)

1	Thope Land 16	Percent i 17	Percent ii 18	Plantation Land 19	Percent i 20	Percent ii 21	Non Agricultural Assets 22	Percent i 23	Percent ii 24	Total Assets 25	Percent i 26	Percent ii 27	Assets Per Household 28
1. Major Landlords	1028075	66.60	9.95	787500	60.39	7.62	2179480	36.28	21.09	10335899	49.54	100	939627
2. Medium Landlords	218725	14.16	12.05	54000	4.14	2.97	451240	7.51	24.85	1815502	8.70	100	181550
3. Non-labouring Small landowners	33370	2.16	2.90	25000	1.92	2.17	394725	6.57	34.32	1150310	5.51	100	104573
4. PEASANTS													
1) 1>0≤ 0.249	107529	6.97	6.18	21000	1.61	1.21	291920	4.86	16.78	1739476	8.34	100	75629
2) 0.250-0.749	9000	0.58	1.35	2000	0.15	0.30	211675	3.52	31.67	668340	3.20	100	35176
3) 0.750-1.249	3000	0.19	2.56	0	-	-	31880	0.53	27.17	117332	0.56	100	14667
4) 1.250-1.999	25150	1.63	7.50	9500	0.73	2.84	124167	2.07	37.04	335238	1.61	100	20952
5) 2.000-4.999	8700	0.56	3.33	0	-	-	122930	2.05	47.14	260788	1.25	100	10030
6) 1≥ 5.000	16500	1.07	6.81	0	-	-	90978	1.51	37.54	242324	1.16	100	20194
5. AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS													
1)a Ownership & Operational	6500	0.42	1.76	0	-	-	139619	2.32	37.86	368744	1.77	100	12291
1)b Operational, No Ownership	0			0	-	-	37940	0.63	76.86	49364	0.24	100	2904
1)c Ownership, No Operational	11250	0.73	8.81	0	-	-	29070	0.48	22.75	127771	0.61	100	9127
2) Neither Own, Nor Operational	6788	0.44	1.20	4500	0.34	0.80	500265	8.33	88.66	564226	2.71	100	2195
6. NON AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS													
1) Ownership &/Or Operational	700	0.05	0.96	0	-	-	57600	0.96	78.77	73120	0.35	100	9140
2) Neither Own Nor Operational	0	-	-	5000	0.38	11.26	35632	0.59	80.24	44404	0.21	100	2114

TABLE 39: (contd)

1	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
7. MAIN INCOME FROM BUSINESS ACTIVITY OTHER THAN AGRICULTURE													
1) Ownership &/Or Operational	11610	0.75	1.47	125000	9.59	15.86	409805	6.82	51.99	788208	3.78	100	34269
2) Neither Own, Nor Operational	1100	0.07	0.21	136000	10.43	25.66	337481	5.62	63.66	530107	2.54	100	9300
8. ARTISANAL ACTIVITY, TRADITIONAL CALLING													
1) Ownership &/Or Operational	18650	1.21	7.57	0	-	-	53344	0.89	21.64	246464	1.18	100	18959
2) Neither Own, Nor Operational	3500	0.23	6.47	3500	0.27	6.47	43620	0.73	80.59	54126	0.26	100	2353
9. SALARIED PERSONS, PROFESSIONALS													
1) Ownership &/Or Operational	4379	0.29	0.76	0	-	-	202040	3.37	35.06	576370	2.77	100	64041
2) Neither Own, Nor Operational	500	0.03	0.31	0	-	-	142679	2.37	87.32	163398	0.78	100	6808
10. SMALL RENT, REMITTANCE OAP, ETC.													
1) Ownership &/Or Operational	0	-	-	100000	7.67	27.56	52800	0.88	14.56	362800	1.74	100	72560
2) Neither Own, Nor Operational	0	-	-	6000	0.46	14.28	26010	0.43	61.91	42015	0.20	100	7003
11. Unclassified	28700	1.86	13.94	25000	1.92	12.14	40919	0.68	19.88	205877	0.99	100	29411
Total	1543726	100	7.40	1304000	100	6.25	6007019	100	28.80	20862203	100	100	32096

NOTE: Percent (i) indicates percentages to column totals;
Percent (ii) indicates percentages to row totals.

TABLE 40: ASSETS OF HOUSEHOLDS: AVERAGE ASSET HOLDINGS BY ASSET CATEGORY, BY CLASS

		Crop Land	Other Agri-cultural Assets	Draught Animals	Other Live-Stock	Thope Land	Plantation Land	Non Agricul-tural Assets	All Assets
1		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Major Landlords	13	541795	29194	2115	2951	93461	71591	198135	939627
2. Medium Landlords	8	103459	2971	1455	1269	21873	5400	45124	181550
3. Non Labouring Small Landholders	11	62164	579	200	440	3034	2273	35884	104573
4. Peasantry									
1) [illegible] l > 0 ≤ 0.249	23	55198	969	587	595	4675	913	12692	75629
2) 0.250-0.749	19	21222	1559	363	312	474	105	11141	35176
3) 0,750-1.249	8	9363	498	313	134	375	0	3985	14667
4) 1.250-1.999	16	9687	283	706	350	1572	594	7760	20952
5) 2.000-4.999	26	3841	324	567	236	335	0	4728	10030
6) [illegible] l ≥ 5.000	12	9933	266	325	713	1375	0	7582	20194
5. Agricultural Labourers									
1)a With Own and Operational Holdings	30	6786	11	360	264	217	0	4654	12291
1)b With Operational, But no Own Holdings	17	0	45	571	56	0	0	2232	2904
1)c With Ownership, But No Operational Holdings	14	6212	2	0	32	804	0	2076	9127
2) With Neither Own Nor Operational Holdings	257	0	1	25	179	26	18	1947	2195
6. Non Agricultural Labourers									
1) With Own And/Or Operational Holdings	8	1713	0	0	140	88	0	7200	9140
2) With Neither Own Nor Operational Holdings	21	107	0	0	72	0	238	1697	2114

TABLE 40: Contd

1		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7. Main Income from Business Activity Other than Agriculture									
1) With Own and/Or Operational Holdings	23	964	121	143	610	505	5435	17818	34270
2) With Neither Own Nor Operational Holdings	57	842	0	14	118	19	2386	5921	9300
8. Main Earnings from Artisanal Activity, Work at Traditional Caste Calling									
1) With Own And/Or Operational Holdings	13	12850	500	35	36	1435	0	4103	18959
2) With Neither Own, Nor Operational Holdings	23	87	0	0	65	152	152	1897	2353
9. Main Earnings from Salaried Persons, Professionals, etc.									
1) With Own And/Or Operational Holdings	9	40598	453	0	54	487	0	22449	64041
2) With Neither Own Nor Operational Holdings	24	801	0	21	21	21	0	5945	6808
10. Main Income from Small Rents, Remittances, OAP, etc									
1) With Own And/Or Operational Holdings	5	42000	0	0	0	0	20000	10560	72560
2) With Neither Own Nor Operational Holdings	6	1667	0	0	1	0	1000	4335	7003
11. Unclassified	7	15214	457	129	94	4100	3571	5846	29411
Total	650	17317	688	200	267	2375	2006	9243	32096

The following is a summary list of nonagricultural assets covered in the survey (see text, p.83, paragraph 2) :

I Monetary and financial assets

1. Commercial bank deposits
2. Post office deposits
3. Cooperative shares
4. Cooperative deposits
5. Shares in joint stock companies
6. Shares in other enterprises
7. L.I.C. policies
8. Government bonds
9. Cash in hand

II Other Assets

10. Cardamom and other estates
11. Agricultural equipment servicing station
12. Agricultural processing ventures
13. Industry
14. Cinema hall
15. Petrol pump
16. Shops
17. Nonagricultural land
18. House or other building
19. Ornaments
20. Means of transport: bicycles, motor bicycles, motor cars, trucks, buses, boats and others
21. Utensils
22. Furniture and other household assets
23. Others.

******